

BX 9420 .A2 E5 1844 v.3
Calvin, Jean, 1509-1564.
Tracts relating to the
reformation

NOTICE

IN REFERENCE TO THE FIRST ISSUE FOR 1851.

The Commentary on the Book of Daniel, Vol. I., which had been intended to form part of the *Second* Issue of the present year, has been postponed until the delivery of the *First* Issue of 1852, to afford the Translator and Editor more leisure to complete a series of important theological and historical investigations for the due illustration of these most interesting Prophecies. They embrace inquiries into the recent researches and discoveries in ancient Assyria and Persia, at Nineveh, Persepolis, &c., and are expected to throw much light on the Book of Daniel.

In these circumstances, the Editorial Secretary deemed it to be an imperative duty, in the present great and remarkable crisis of The Churches of the Reformation, with reference to The Papal Aggression, to bring forward, instead of the postponed volume, some valuable Treatises by Calvin on that all-engrossing subject. This he has been enabled to do without any sacrifice of time, as materials have been in preparation during the last two years to be in readiness to meet this sudden movement of the Papacy, which was fortunately neither unforeseen nor unexpected by him.

The Secretary is confident that the Subscribers will regard the present Collection of Tracts, which were written by Calvin under somewhat similar circumstances and likewise to meet the insidious encroachments and heresies of The Church of Rome, not only as most valuable in themselves, but as most admirably fitted to furnish the armour, offensive and defensive, which is so much required at this juncture by every earnest Protestant.

R. P.

Edinburgh, *June* 20, 1851.

CALVIN'S TRACTS:

CONTAINING

ANTIDOTE TO THE COUNCIL OF TRENT:

GERMAN INTERIM, WITH REFUTATION, AND

TRUE METHOD OF REFORMING THE CHURCH:

CONFORMING TO ROMISH RITES:

PSYCHOPANNYCHIA;

OR, IMAGINARY SLEEP OF THE SOUL BETWEEN DEATH AND JUDGMENT.

VOL. III.

THE CALVIN TRANSLATION SOCIETY

INSTITUTED IN MAY M.DCCC.XLIII.

FOR THE PUBLICATION OF TRANSLATIONS OF THE WORKS OF JOHN CALVIN.

Acting and Editorial Secretary, Robert Pitcairn, F.S.A.Scot.
Calvin Office, 9, Northumberland Street, Edinburgh.

TRACTS

CONTAINING

ANTIDOTE TO THE COUNCIL OF TRENT:

GERMAN INTERIM WITH REFUTATION:

TRUE METHOD OF REFORMING THE CHURCH:

SINFULNESS OF OUTWARD CONFORMITY TO ROMISH RITES:

PSYCHOPANNYCHIA;

OR, THE SOUL'S IMAGINARY SLEEP BETWEEN DEATH AND JUDGMENT.

BY JOHN CALVIN.

TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL LATIN AND FRENCH

BY HENRY BEVERIDGE.

VOLUME THIRD.

EDINBURGH:
PRINTED FOR THE CALVIN TRANSLATION SOCIETY.
M.DCCC.LI.

"CALVIN WAS AN ILLUSTRIOUS PERSON, AND NEVER TO BE MENTIONED WITHOUT A PREFACE OF THE HIGHEST HONOUR."—*Bishop Andrews.*

"CALVIN'S COMMENTARIES REMAIN, AFTER THREE CENTURIES, UNPARALLELED FOR FORCE OF MIND, JUSTNESS OF EXPOSITION, AND PRACTICAL VIEWS OF CHRISTIANITY."
—*Bishop of Calcutta,* (*Wilson.*)

(Entered at Stationer's Hall.)

"THE VENERABLE CALVIN." "I HOLD THE MEMORY OF CALVIN IN HIGH VENERATION. HIS WORKS HAVE A PLACE IN MY LIBRARY; AND IN THE STUDY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES HE IS ONE OF THE COMMENTATORS I MOST FREQUENTLY CONSULT."
—*Bishop Horsley.*

"A MINISTER WITHOUT THIS IS WITHOUT ONE OF THE BEST COMMENTARIES ON THE SCRIPTURES, AND A VALUABLE BODY OF DIVINITY."—*Bickersteth.*

EDINBURGH: PRINTED BY T. CONSTABLE, PRINTER TO HER MAJESTY.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE, . . . vii

I. Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, with the Antidote, m.d.xlvii, . . . 17

II. Adultero-German Interim, with Calvin's Refutation, m.d.xlvii, and . . . 189

The true Method of Reforming the Church and Healing her Divisions, m.d.xlvii, . . 240

III. The Sinfulness of Outward Conformity to Romish Rites, m.d.xxxvii, ... 358

IV. Psychopannychia; or, the Soul's Imaginary Sleep between Death and Judgment, m.d.xxxiv, . 413



TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

The Tracts of the present volume, four in number, have been selected partly on account of their own intrinsic value, and partly on account of the great additional interest which recent occurrences have given to some of the subjects considered in them. They contain lucid discussions on all the leading points in the Popish controversy, furnish wholesome advice in answer to a question which once was, and will probably again become, of great practical importance; and refute the wild dogma which a kind of infidel fanaticism had devised, asserting, that in the interval between death and the final judgment the soul remains in a state of sleep or unconscious existence. All the Tracts sustain the reputation of their distinguished author; and, considering their controversial nature, are not often chargeable with the virulent spirit and intemperate language in which the controversialists of Calvin's age were too prone to indulge.

I.—Canons of the Council of Trent, with the Antidote.

The subject of the First and leading Tract is the Council of Trent. It is believed to be the earliest publication in which the proceedings of that body were fully and systematically reviewed; and notwithstanding all that has since been written on the subject, its use as a complete Protestant manual has not been superseded.

It commences with an Introduction, in which the question of submission to human authority in matters of re-

LIGION is briefly considered. Here, while THE GREAT PROTESTANT PRINCIPLE, that the SCRIPTURES are the only infallible standard, is strenuously maintained, it is admitted that the veneration in which the name of COUNCIL continued to be held, was by no means unfounded; that in earlier and purer times the Church had repeatedly derived essential benefit from the decisions of Councils; and that even now, could a GENERAL COUNCIL be impartially constituted, there was good ground to hope that, by the wisdom of its judgments and the weight of its authority, it would command general submission, and restore Peace to Christendom. Unhappily, however, no means of assembling such a Council then existed. THE POPE, who claimed the right of summoning it, was himself the great offender, and hence any body, in the composition of which he was to have the principal share, would be far more disposed to perpetuate abuses than to remove them.

The truth of this assertion is established by appealing to the actual composition of the so-called GENERAL COUNCIL OF TRENT. The leading classes of which it consisted are subjected to a rigid scrutiny, and a graphic description is given of their mode of procedure. Not only were no names of eminence to be found amongst them, but even the little judgment which they possessed they were not at liberty to exercise. Their decisions were first dictated by a set of captious wrangling Monks and Canonists, and then dispatched post-haste to Rome! The POPE and his minions made whatever changes they pleased; and the document, thus concocted and thus mutilated, on being returned to the Council, at once rose to the dignity of a Canon, "The Fathers" merely giving a mechanical nod of assent. Infallibility claimed under such circumstances was ludicrous in the extreme!

After dissecting the COUNCIL, and proving by an analysis of its constituent parts that its determinations ought to be received with suspicion, and, at all events, had no weight beyond that which their real merits might give them, CALVIN proceeds to consider the Opening ADDRESS OF THE LEGATES; and, founding on their own confession, shews that the cor-

ruptions and abuses which existed in the Papacy, and thoroughly tainted its whole mass, more than justified those who, after endeavouring in vain to purify it, had formally withdrawn their allegiance.

It is still common with Romish Writers to deny that their Church had fallen much away from the purity of early times, or been guilty of misdeeds which account for the general outcry which had been raised against her. Their theory accordingly is, that THE REFORMATION mainly had its origin in the vanity, ambition, and turbulence of a single individual, and owed its rapid progress to the rich spoils with which it tempted the avarice of its more powerful supporters. Human nature having been the same then that it is now, it were vain to deny that the motives of not a few who embraced the Reformation were of a mixed, and consequently not of the purest nature; but if any one questions the prevalence of gross iniquity in the PAPACY at the commencement of the sixteenth century, he may easily satisfy himself by merely reading the ADDRESS OF THE LEGATES. None could know the fact better than they; and corruption must have been very general and very notorious before they could venture, in a fit of candour, or feel compelled by the promptings of a burdened conscience, to colour it so darkly! Well might CALVIN, taking them at their own word, contrast the impure lives of their Clergy with those of THE EARLY REFORMERS, and triumphantly ask, In which of the two bodies the marks of a true Church were most visibly displayed?

Preliminary matters having been disposed of, THE CANONS themselves come under review; and that all fairness may be done, each as it is considered is first given *verbatim*, and then followed by a REFUTATION, or what is called its ANTIDOTE. Here CALVIN avoids minute criticism, and discarding minor points, dwells on those of primary importance. He thus obtains full scope for the comprehensive views with which his own mind was familiar; and saving his readers the tedious process of tracking out mere flaws, furnishes them with mighty weapons, by which PAPAL INFALLIBILITY, and all that has been built upon it, are easily overthrown.

The fundamental points fully considered are THE RULE OF

Faith, Original Sin, Justification, and the Sacrifice and Merits of Christ. In regard to all of these, it is clearly shewn that the Heresies of the Papists are numerous and deadly. Not satisfied with the Canon of Scripture, as sanctioned in early times, they pronounce anathema on all who refuse to receive the Apocrypha as inspired, though they cannot but be aware that one of its writers, in distinct terms, disclaims inspiration. Instead of going to the original tongues for the genuine text, they insist that one version only shall be held to be authentic, and that version the Vulgate, which is here shewn by Calvin to be marred by the grossest and most ludicrous blunders. Then, even the text itself must be placed under *surveillance*, and he who reads must not take the meaning which the words import, how palpable soever they may be, but set it aside for any different or contradictory meaning which the Pope and his minions may be pleased to dictate!

Again, in regard to Original Sin, the doctrine of the Tridentine Canon, though artfully endeavouring to conceal its true character, is proved to be Pelagianism under a very flimsy disguise. In the important act of Justification man is made to divide with his Maker, and apparently carries off the larger share. And worse than all, the great Sacrifice which Christ offered on the cross, and then perfected once for all, is deliberately travestied; and not only exhibited under a form in which none of its features can be recognised, but made the pretext for innumerable acts of Idolatry—Idolatry not less gross, and far less excusable, than that which the darkest abodes of heathenism can furnish.

But it is impossible to give a full analysis of important discussions, which the author himself has compressed into the narrowest possible limits. Nor is it necessary. Enough has been said to justify the high opinion entertained of the Tract, and satisfy those who are willing to acquaint themselves with its merits, that the perusal will not disappoint them.

II. ADULTERO-GERMAN INTERIM, WITH THE REFUTATION.

The SECOND TRACT is intimately connected with the First, and has much ground in common with it. The mode of discussion, however, is different. Many topics slightly touched on in the one are fully expanded in the other; and hence, so far from superseding each other, they require to be combined in order to form a complete whole.

The preliminary part of this TRACT is an exact copy of a celebrated document known by the name of the INTERIM, because intended by the EMPEROR CHARLES V. to regulate the *interim* state of religious belief, and possession of ecclesiastical property within Germany, until some more permanent arrangement could be made. The concluding, and the larger, as well as the far more interesting part of the Tract, is a Review by CALVIN, in which, in opposition to what he calls the Adultero-German Interim, he at great length, and with his usual ability, points out the TRUE METHOD OF REFORMING THE CHURCH AND HEALING HER DISSENSIONS.

The device of the INTERIM was certainly chimerical in the extreme. In the circumstances in which GERMANY was placed, the attempt to regulate the possession of property merely was sufficiently difficult, because much of it not properly possessed by either party was in a kind of undetermined or transition state, and could not fail to be made the subject of competing and keenly agitated claims. CHARLES V., however, as if he had thought such considerations beneath his Imperial notice, took the far more important and extravagant step of drawing up a regular CONFESSION OF FAITH, fixing the precise limits within which the Religious Belief of the Germans would be allowed to range. This CONFESSION was drawn up by Pflug and Helding, two Roman Catholic theologians, and Agricola, a nominal Protestant, suspected of having been bribed to betray his party. In substance it contains an undisguised transcript of Popery; but endeavours to conciliate the PROTESTANTS, by allowing those of the Clergy who had been Priests and had married, to retain their wives; and conceding to their people the

Communion, in both kinds. Even these privileges, like the document which granted them, were only *interim!*

This attempt at mediation, one-sided though it was, proved almost as displeasing to the favoured as to the prejudiced party. The ROMAN CATHOLICS were determined to make no concession, and nothing in their opponents could satisfy them except an unconditional surrender. The PROTESTANTS could not but feel insulted by seeing their dearest privileges peremptorily refused, and the only two which were admitted suspended on a mere peradventure. The INTERIM thus settled nothing, and in so far as it had any effect, only tended to make confusion worse confounded. In one respect, however, it gave serious alarm to many enlightened Protestants. Not a few of their adherents, unable to withstand the fiery trial to which they had for some time been exposed, were inwardly desirous of some plausible pretext which might enable them, without formally renouncing their faith, to escape from the hardships which they endured in consequence of professing it. To persons so disposed the very name of concession was sufficient; and now, on the ground that their *status* as Protestants was formally recognised, and that the privileges conceded would only prove the forerunners of many others, numbers seemed determined to accept of the INTERIM. Violent dissensions accordingly arose between the zealous and the lukewarm adherents of Protestantism, and the union which constituted their main strength was in danger of being broken up.

To still these troubled waves a powerful voice was required, and CALVIN again came forward. It was not, however, as a mediator! He had seen the name so often abused by the lukewarm and indifferent, for the purpose of promoting selfish views, that he almost abhorred it. His tone, therefore, was firm and resolute; and even MELANCTHON, whom he loved as a brother, fell under his rebuke. Fixing his eye on the path of duty, and determined to know no other path, he goes minutely over the controverted points, shewing the impossibility of reconciling two systems so discordant as POPERY and PROTESTANTISM; and, calling upon each man to make up his mind and decide, as for eternity, concludes

with a noble passage, which speaks the language and breathes the spirit of a Martyr.

III. The Sinfulness of outward conformity to Romish Rites.

The Third Tract is in the form of an Epistle to a Friend who had sincerely embraced the Reformed Faith, but, living under the tyranny of the Papacy, must have forfeited his life by openly professing it. The question which Calvin is requested to answer is, How can a person so situated maintain his religious integrity? Under this question more is meant than is actually expressed; and it is impossible to read Calvin's reply without perceiving that the question, as he understood it, and as it was doubtless intended to be understood, was neither more nor less than this, Is it lawful for a person who has renounced Popery in his heart to conform outwardly to its Rites, for the purpose of avoiding persecution, or for any other imaginable cause? When the question is thus broadly stated, it seems impossible to hesitate for a moment to answer in the negative; and yet, for honestly giving this answer, and persisting in giving it, Calvin incurred the displeasure of a very numerous class of so-called Protestants, and was held up to obloquy as a selfish and rigid disciplinarian, who, secure from danger in his own nook at Geneva, would make no allowance for his brethren who were far less favourably situated, and would sooner see them suffering in the flames than yielding an outward compliance with some absurd but harmless Rite! So loud was the outcry raised against him on this account, that Calvin, though little disposed to defer to mere authority, when his own judgment was thoroughly convinced, not only triumphantly defended himself in several Apologetic Writings, but requested and obtained a formal confirmation of his opinion from the distinguished Theologians, Peter Martyr, Bucer, and Melancthon.

It is easy to see how very desirable it must have been for those who had embraced Protestantism, but could not profess it without endangering their lives, to discover some

device which might enable them, without formally renouncing their faith, to live amidst its enemies as securely as if they had renounced it; but it is certainly very difficult to imagine what that device could be, since it requires to unite in itself the impossibilities of acting honestly towards God and fraudulently towards men. Necessity, however, is ingenious; and not one merely, but a whole series of arguments were devised and strenuously insisted on, as sufficient to prove that a man thoroughly convinced of the abominations of Popery might, notwithstanding, take part openly in the observance of its Rites.

One of these arguments was, that the person so complying might at the time be inwardly performing an act of pure devotion—might, for instance, at Mass, when the host was raised, kneel to Christ seated at the right hand of his Father in heaven, while the deluded multitude around him were kneeling before the consecrated wafer. Other arguments, all necessarily of the same Jesuitical nature, were employed with the full sanction of men who called themselves Protestant Divines; and it was even thought that precedents in point might be found in the case of Naaman, who was permitted by the Prophet to accompany his master into the house of Rimmon, and the case of Paul, who tried to conciliate his countrymen by making a vow.

The whole subject, including several collateral points of importance, is here considered by Calvin in all its bearings, in a spirit of sympathy, meekness, and candour, shewing how well he could feel for those who were so unhappy as to have their homes where they could not serve God freely, and yet in a spirit of inflexible firmness, which would not allow him to sacrifice one *iota* of what he believed to be the truth, though it were to gain a world.

IV. Psychopannychia; or, the soul's imaginary sleep.

The Fourth and concluding Tract has the somewhat singular title of Psychopannychia, derived from Greek words which signify "the sleep of the soul;" the object of the Tract being to shew, partly from reason, but more especially

from Scripture, that there is no such sleep. It was published in 1534, when CALVIN was twenty-five years of age, and is, consequently, with the exception of the Commentary on the Clementia of Seneca, published in 1532, the earliest of all his writings, and two years earlier than the Institutes, the first known edition of which appeared in 1536. It thus possesses, especially to those who delight to trace the progress of a master mind, an interest additional to that which its merit gives it.

The figment which it refutes is said by CALVIN to be of Arabian origin, but was first brought prominently into notice by some of the wildest fanatics among the ANABAPTISTS, for whom everything new and monstrous appears to have had an irresistible attraction. In more modern times, attempts have been made to give it a philosophical shape, as a necessary corollary from the dogma of Materialism advocated by Priestley and others.

It would seem that the figment, wild and irrational though it is, had made considerable progress at an early period of the Reformation, and counted numerous converts, not merely among the fanatics who had revived it, but in more respectable quarters, where better things might have been expected.

One is puzzled to understand why it should have been received with so much favour; for the idea which it suggests, so far from being attractive, is naturally revolting. It was probably welcomed, not so much for its own sake, as for the great assistance which it was supposed capable of giving in THE POPISH CONTROVERSY. Were it once established that the soul falls asleep at death, and will not awake to consciousness till again united to the body at the resurrection, THE POPE would forthwith be excluded from the larger half of his domain, and deprived of the most lucrative branches of his trade! There would neither be SAINTS to whom divine honours could be paid, nor PURGATORY out of which poor souls might be delivered with more or less expedition, according to the number of well-paid masses that were said for them!

If the cordial reception given to the dogma was owing to the collateral benefit thus supposed to be derived from it, it

only adds another to the many instances in which blind man would arrogantly give lessons to his Maker, and arrange the world on a better plan than His infinite wisdom has devised. Because it would furnish a triumphant refutation of Popish legends and fictions—the soul must be made to perish with the body, and a common ruin overtake both!

It would appear that the subject had attracted attention in England, for we find that the TRACT was translated in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. The title-page is as follows:—

"A Treatise of the Immortality of the Soule, by which it is proued that soules after the departure of the bodies are awake and do liue: against those that think they do sleep. By JOHN CALUIN. Translated out of French by Tho. Stocker." It was "Imprinted by John Day. London, 1581."

In the PSYCHOPANNYCHIA, CALVIN, knowing the kind of people he had to deal with, accommodates himself to their capacities; and instead of entering largely into speculative disquisitions which the subject seems to suggest, and to which the metaphysical cast of his own mind must have strongly inclined him, dwells chiefly on THE SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT — carefully examining all the passages which the advocates of the dogma had adduced as favourable to their view, and adducing others by which it is completely overthrown. If by the adoption of this plan, the TRACT loses somewhat in point of philosophical exactness, it gains much in richness of scriptural illustration; and proves that, even at this early period, in writing his first theological publication, CALVIN gave promise of the almost unrivalled excellence to which he ultimately attained as a COMMENTATOR.

H. B.

May 1851.

ACTS

OF

THE COUNCIL OF TRENT:

WITH

THE ANTIDOTE.

JOHN CALVIN TO THE PIOUS READER.

It is said that Cato, when about to address the Roman People for the purpose of urging them to correct their extravagant expenditure, began by premising that he should have a difficult task to perform, as the belly had no ears. My task, were I to exhort the Romanists of the present day to restore the doctrine of godliness, and cleanse the Church of corruption, would be much more difficult: for I should have to contend not only with a deaf belly, but with blind ambition. We see, that however they may be vanquished in argument, they nevertheless continue obstinate, because they think they have to fight for honour and life. I will not, therefore, be so foolish as to attempt in vain to recall them to a sound mind; those of them, I mean, whose contumacy is seen to be altogether desperate. I will rather turn in a different direction, and let all the godly see how abominable the impiety of those men is. Of this I here exhibit no obscure specimen in the Acts of the Council of Trent, in which they have so explained all their inward feelings, as to leave nobody in doubt what the state of the Church would be if it depended on their decision.

But that this may the better appear, I beg and exhort my readers first to peruse my treatise on the Necessity of Reforming the Church; and thereafter, on comparing, decide to which party they ought to incline.

Geneva, 21*st November* 1547.

ADMONITION AND EXHORTATION OF THE LEGATES OF THE APOSTOLIC SEE TO THE FATHERS IN THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

READ IN THE FIRST SESSION.

Reverend Fathers, &c.—Seeing that the very nature of the office assigned to us, who in this Holy Council perform the part of Presidents and Legates of the Apostolic See,[1] seems to demand that, amid the multiplicity of business to be despatched in this sacred assembly to the glory of God and the good of the Church, we should repeatedly address you by way of exhortation and admonition; more especially have we thought it right not to omit so to do in this first Session, which will, we hope, give a happy commencement to the whole Council. And we perform this duty the more willingly, because, while we either exhort you to act worthily of this great assembly, or dissuade you from the contrary, we also exhort and dissuade ourselves, who are as it were in the same vessel with you, exposed to the same perils and the same storms; we say, we excite ourselves to watch, that we may neither fall among rocks, numbers of which will doubtless appear during this voyage, nor by our negligence allow the magnitude of the business to overwhelm us like waves of the sea; but, sustained by faith and hope, may guide the vessel in that special direction where a haven of safety shall appear to the glory of God in Jesus Christ.

Therefore, to begin with that of which, particularly at the outset, we ought also to be reminded, each one of us ought to place in his view, first of all, what the things are which are expected from this sacred Council. Thereby each will easily understand how great a burden lies upon him.

[1] The Legates were, John Maria de Monte, a Bishop, Cardinal of Palestrina, Marcellus Cervinus, Priest of the Holy Cross, and Reginald Pole, Deacon of St. Mary in Cosmedin.

Now, the things expected (to embrace them all summarily) are those contained in the Bull calling the Council, namely, The Extirpation of Heresies, The Restoration of Ecclesiastical Discipline and Reformation of Manners, and, finally, The External Peace of the whole Church. These, therefore, are the things for which it behoves us to care, or which we ought constantly to pray that God would of his goodness grant.

And there is one thing of which, above all, at the very outset of the Council, we have thought that all, collectively and individually, who have here assembled, and especially we ourselves who preside in this sacred function, ought to be admonished—never to imagine that, either by the individuals here present, or by the whole Council, were all the Pastors throughout the world here met, could a cure be provided for the great evils by which the flock of Christ is now oppressed. If we think that this can be accomplished by us, or by any other than Christ himself, whom God the Father hath given to be our only Saviour and Pastor, to whom also he hath given all power, we certainly err at the very foundation in all our doings, and shall still further provoke the Divine anger. For to the former evils which have befallen us, because we have forsaken the very fountain of living water, we add the other very grievous sin of wishing to cure those evils by our own power or skill, so that what the Prophet says in the name of God, accusing his ancient people, might justly be said of us—This people hath committed two evils; they have forsaken me, the fountain of living water, and hewn out to themselves cisterns not fit to contain water. Such cisterns are all the counsels which proceed from our own wisdom, uninspired by the Divine Spirit. Such counsels not only are not able to keep the people in piety and obedience, like water in cisterns; but the more we labour to confirm them by these devices, the more violently do they, like torrents, flow from us, and go away, as the experience of former years, in many places, may sufficiently teach; while it now reminds us that only one method of curing these evils remains—if, acknowledging that all our remedies are useless, and are fitter to increase evils than to take them away, we, who hold the place of

Fathers, do in all things flee in faith and hope to the power of Christ, whom God the Father calls his right hand, and to the wisdom of Christ, which is the wisdom of the Father, acknowledging ourselves to be in all things his servants. Moreover, (says the Apostle,) it is required of stewards that a man be found faithful. (1 Cor. iv. 2.) What must now be done, is in all things to shew ourselves fit servants. And we shall be fit, if we judge that of ourselves we are by no means fit. For who, says the same Apostle, is sufficient for these things? And therefore we are not to think anything of ourselves, as if of ourselves we were sufficient.

But it is not enough for us thus to confess. The Apostle could say, that by this gate he entered in to fulfil his office, and that he therein shewed himself a fit and faithful minister; for he could at the same time say, I am conscious to myself of nothing. But we, if we will confess the truth, cannot but say that, in administering the office assigned us, we are conscious of having failed in very many things, and have in no small degree been the cause of those evils which we are met to correct. For as it is not enough to confess that we are unequal to so great an office, what more must we do in order to be at this time the fit ministers of Christ in renewing the Church? The same thing undoubtedly which Christ himself, the Bishop of our souls, did when he came to found and form his Church. The same thing assuredly, Fathers, must we do which the very Wisdom of the Father did, when he came to lead many sons unto glory. This is the thing at which we ought now to aim. For he, seeing all men overwhelmed in sin, took the sins of all upon himself, and made himself alone guilty and condemned before God for all, and bore the penalty due by us, as if he had himself committed all the iniquities and crimes of which we had been guilty; whereas he was perfectly free from all taint of sin, inasmuch as he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth. What Christ thus did, out of boundless love, towards God the Father, and pity towards our race, justice itself now demands that we shall do, in order that we pastors may not stand guilty before the tribunal of the

divine mercy of all those evils by which the flock of Christ is oppressed, and, transferring the sins of all to ourselves, not so much from pity as justice, because in truth we are in a great measure the cause of these evils, implore the divine mercy through Jesus Christ. When we said that we pastors have given occasion to the evils by which the Church is oppressed, should any one think the language exaggerated, and more strongly than truly expressed, experience, which cannot lie, will prove its truth.

Let us look then for a little to the evils by which the Church is oppressed, and at the same time to our sins. But these who can number? Along with other evils, they are more than the sand of the sea, and cry aloud to heaven. Let us therefore circumscribe the multitude of our sins within those limits within which this Council summoned to cure the worst of evils has circumscribed them. These, as we have mentioned above, are three, viz., heresies, decay of discipline, intestine and external war. Here, then, let us see and consider, since the Church has been now for many years vexed with these calamities, in what sources they had their origin—whether we did not in some measure begin—whether we have not fomented them.

First, let us examine the beginning of the Heresies which have everywhere sprung up in this our day. Should we deny that we gave a beginning to them because we ourselves have not been the authors of any heresy, still, inasmuch as perverse opinions concerning faith are a kind of brambles and thorns which have sprung up in the field of the Lord, given to us to cultivate, although these have risen of their own accord, as weeds are sometimes wont to do, yet he who has not cultivated the field as he ought—who has not sown it—who, as the weeds sprung up spontaneously, has not been careful to extirpate them, may be said to have given them a beginning, just as if he had sown them, especially considering that they all derive their origin and increase from the carelessness of the husbandman. Here, then, let those who are husbandmen in the Lord's field examine themselves, let them ask their conscience how they have acted in cultivating and in sowing. Those who have

done so, especially in these times in which very few labour in cultivating the field of the Lord, have, we presume, little doubt that to themselves belongs the blame of the heresies which have grown rank in every part of the Church. But enough has been said by way of admonition concerning the evils which belong to the first head.

Let us come to the second, which relates to The Decay of Discipline, and what are called Abuses. Here it is of no use to spend time in inquiring who were the authors of those great evils, since beside ourselves no others can be named.

Let us therefore proceed to the third head, which relates to The Obstacles to the Peace of the Church, such as wars, domestic or foreign. For these long ago disturbed the peace of the Church, and disturb it still. Here we only say, that if war be (as God has shewn by infallible signs) the scourge by which he chastises us, then as we are guilty under the two former heads, in regard to which we cannot excuse ourselves, so we cannot deny that we are the principal cause of those wars. Such scourges, we presume, God sends in order to chastise us as sinners, and set before our eyes the very sins by which we have most grievously offended his majesty. Here let every one who has observed in what way the Church has been vexed by warlike violence, consider with himself what those things are in which the Church thereby suffers loss. Nor does it matter here of what kind of warfare we speak—whether of the intestine wars of our own princes, or the foreign wars of Turks, which of late years have brought great calamities upon us, or of the wars of those who have thrown off obedience to their pastors, and driven them from their sees. What we say applies in general to all kinds of warfare, including that of those who have wielded weapons against us—have banished pastors from their churches—confounded orders—substituted laymen in the room of bishops—plundered the property of the Church, and obstructed the course of the Word of God. Here we say, that if those who claim the name of pastors will but read what is contained in the book on the abuses of pastors, the greater part of them will find it stated, in express terms, that they have themselves committed them. For they will find that

our ambition, our avarice, our passions first brought those evils on the people of God. Owing to them pastors were driven from their churches, and churches deprived of the nurture of the Word; the property of churches, which is the property of the poor, was taken from them; the priests' office was conferred on unworthy persons, and given to those differing in no respect from laity except in dress, and not even in this. Which of these things can we deny that we have done in recent years? Wherefore if the Turk, if heretics do the very same against us, what else do we behold than our own flagrant misdeeds, and at the same time see the just judgment of God—a judgment, however, fraught with mercy? For had he chastised us according to our deservings, we should long ago have been as Sodom and as Gomorrah.

But why do we now bring these things to mind? Is it for your confusion? Far from it. It is rather to admonish you as dear fathers and brethren, and first of all admonish ourselves how we may be able to avoid the scourges which now chastise us, and the severer scourges impending, unless we repent, that we may escape the dreadful judgment of God—dreadful indeed to all the impenitent, but especially to those who rule. Those who rule, says Scripture, will be severely judged. We see that judgment now begins at the house of God. While priests are cast out and trampled under feet of men, what else is indicated but the Divine judgment upon us, which our Saviour foretold when he said that his priests are the salt of the earth, but if the salt hath lost its savour, it is good for nothing but to be cast out and trodden under feet of men? All these things we now suffer. If it were for righteousness' sake, like our forefathers, happy were we; but now it is justly, because the salt has lost its savour. We do not at all suffer for righteousness' sake; for in all our afflictions we see the just judgment of God. Would, indeed, that we did see it; for this were the first step of escape from all the judgments and chastisements of God, and of entrance into favour and true glory.

It is this that has made us longer and stricter in calling these things to mind. For unless these things be known, and

thoroughly understood, in vain do we enter the Council, in vain do we invoke the Holy Spirit, who always makes His first entrance into the soul of man by condemning the man himself, that He may convict the world of sin. Wherefore, unless that Spirit have first condemned us to ourselves, we may be assured that he has not entered into us, and will not even enter if we refuse to listen to our sins. For the same thing will be said to us which was said to the ancient people by the Prophet Ezekiel, when without acknowledging their sins, they wished to inquire at God through the Prophet. The Prophet speaks thus,—"The children of Israel came to me to inquire at the Lord, and sat before me. But thus saith the Lord, Have you come to inquire at me? As I live, saith the Lord, I will not answer you. And he adds, "If you judge them, shew them the abominations of their fathers." In these words God shews why he refused to answer them, viz., because they had not yet listened to their own abominations and those of their fathers. Wherefore, seeing the Divine Spirit who then gave responses is the same whom we now invoke, while sitting before the Lord, you see what we have to do to procure a proper answer, and at the same time how necessary it was for us who preside in this sacred assembly to employ our first address in laying open our sins.

But as we now see some grievously lamenting, first their own sins and those of our order, and with earnest prayer imploring the Divine mercy, we have the strongest hopes that the Spirit of God, whom we invoke, has come to us. For we regard as the grand pledge of the Divine mercy, this very commencement of the Council in which we are now convened to raise up and renovate the almost fallen Church, as the ancient people, after their long captivity among foreign princes, returned to Jerusalem to rebuild the Temple. In the state of that people, in their joyful departure for their native land, and the rebuilding of the Temple, we may behold an image of our own time and state, especially in this Council, and in the example of the leaders of that people, You who are leaders of the people of God on their way to the heavenly country, see your duty. Wherefore, we strongly

exhort all of you often to call to mind what is written in the Books of Ezra, and Nehemiah, and Daniel, in which the counsels of all the leaders of the people are unfolded, as having always had this one end in view, viz., by confessing their own sins and those of the people, to stir up all to repentance and supplication for the Divine mercy. When the people did so, everything went well with them. If we would expect success, and a happy issue in rebuilding the Church, for which cause we have here gladly assembled, we must follow the same counsels, and this the more, because greater contests await us in rebuilding the Church than they had in rebuilding the Temple. For if many opposed them to prevent the accomplishment of the work, and many, too, when they could not prevent it, derided, rest assured that we too shall not be without mockers, and others who will do their utmost to call us off, and deter us from our undertaking. We shall have to wrestle not only with flesh and blood, but with spiritual wickednesses in high places. But He in whose name we have engaged in the work is more powerful than they. Wherefore, let us trust in him, let us call upon him in prayer, and he will bring all things to pass.

But as this Council is intended both for deliberation and judgment, as we are both to deliberate concerning the things which pertain to the good of the whole Church, and judge as well of things as of persons, (for we sit as it were judging the twelve tribes of Israel, in which is comprehended the whole people of God,) this seems the most proper place for admonishing ourselves, to beware of those things which usually impair the faculties both of deliberation and judgment. These are the passions of the mind, and are also termed perturbations, because they disturb the judgment and feelings, and pervert them from what is right and true. Among these things we must specially guard against those which a heathen historian rightly discards from counsel when he says, "All men consulting on dubious matters should be free from anger, hatred, and friendship." To such passions all mankind are prone, but those are particularly so who are in the service of princes; for they are under stronger

affections, and most readily speak from favour or hatred, no doubt, as they think the princes themselves affected, to whom they look for reward. When we speak of princes we mean as well those called ecclesiastical as those who are secular; and though we acknowledge and are glad that we have Christian princes, a privilege which in ancient times, when the Church was newly founded, our fathers had not, still it must before all things be observed by us in this Council, that this is not the place for praising any one but God alone, in Jesus Christ, justifying him only, and condemning every class of men, and first of all ourselves who thus speak, so that we should say with Daniel, "To us belongs confusion of face; to our kings, our princes, and our fathers, who have sinned; but to thee our Lord God, mercy and forgiveness; for we have forsaken thee, and not listened to the voice of the Lord our God, to walk in the law which he hath given us by his servants the Prophets. And all Israel have broken thy law, and turned aside from hearkening to thy voice, and curse and detestation have descended upon us." (Dan. ix. 8-11.)

This is perhaps the place where, after the example of the same Prophet whose words we have just quoted, we who are priests should not only confess our own sins, but those of the people and the princes, before God and his Church, and implore pardon for all. For Daniel speaks thus,—"When I was yet speaking and praying, and confessing my own sins and the sins of my people"—under the name of people in this place comprehending people of all ranks, as his confession just quoted declares. In this matter he seems plainly to intimate what we who have come hither for the safety of the whole Church, now suffering from so many evils, have to do, namely, with tears to confess our own sins, and also those of the princes and people, as we now do abundantly in the spirit of sorrow, but would do more exuberantly in words, were the princes themselves present to join us with their confession and their tears. But in such matters the sins of the priests, and princes, and people also, are bound together, as the Prophets express it, as with a rope of sins, so that it is difficult to inquire into the sins of one class,

without at the same time making manifest the sins of other classes. Hence Ezekiel, accusing all classes in one continued discourse, thus speaks in the name of God among his ancient people. "Their priests have despised my law, and polluted my sanctuary. Their princes in the midst of them, like ravening wolves, in shedding blood, destroying souls, and greedily following after lucre, have made no distinction between sacred and profane. The nations of the earth uttered calumny." Would that these words were applicable to those times only, and did not exhibit an image of our own! Would that when we speak of the corruption of priests, we were able to affirm that princes and people have not given the greatest occasion, the largest materials and sanction to it! But let us now reserve our words for a more reasonable time, and open fountains of common tears.

We now return to those whom we have taken it upon us to admonish, especially the Bishops who have come hither with mandates from princes. Our advice to them is to serve their princes with all fidelity and diligence, but, as becomes bishops, to serve as the servants of God and not as the servants of men. Be unwilling, says the Apostle, to be the servants of men. First, let them serve the one King Christ, to whom God the Father hath given all power; next, for his sake let them serve all, and especially their princes, giving honour to whom honour is due, tribute to whom tribute. And we exhort them to serve their princes in regard to honour, as they bear their commands in words in which nothing almost is proposed but what is honourable and aims at the public good. In one word, let them so serve as aiming especially at the honour of God and the utility of this Council, which has been convened for the public good. Wherefore as we most earnestly exhort all who are to give their opinions here before God and his angels and the whole Church, not to speak for the favour of any man, so much more do we exhort them not to utter a sentence from hatred of any man, though he bear the character of an opponent, or hater, or an open foe.

In fine, it is our earnest wish and exhortation in the Lord, that we abstain from all strife among ourselves. For these

are the things which grieve and repel the Holy Spirit whom we have invoked, and without whom we shall not be able to do anything at all for the good and peace of the Church. For, says the Apostle, seeing there are contentions among you, are you not men and do you not walk after man? In calling them men, he means that they are devoid of the Spirit of God.

But in all things which pertain to The Reformation of the Church, (the object for which we have met,) it behoves us to imitate him who formed it at first, of whom, when entering upon his work, the prophet in the name of God thus speaks: "Behold my servant whom I have chosen, my beloved in whom my soul is well pleased; I have sent my Spirit upon him, he will announce judgment to the Gentiles: he will not contend, nor cry. The bruised reed he will not break, the smoking flax he will not quench." This Spirit of peace, charity, and meekness, as we ought always to shew before all and with all, so more especially in this sacred assembly in which we have met, that by the grace of the Spirit himself an end may be put to the contentions which have too long vexed the Church. Wherefore we who bear the office of peace-makers must be particularly careful not to give any one any handle for contention. This and all other inconveniences and hinderances shall we avoid by the only means of peace, and we shall arrive at the wished for haven of peace, if with prayers sent from humble and contrite hearts we beseech the Spirit of Christ, who is our peace, to preside in this Council, to pour light into our hearts, and overrule and direct us in all things to his own honour and the real good of the Church. For to such he himself says: "While you yet speak, lo! I am present." Wherefore, we entreat you in the Lord to be constant in such prayers with all possible charity, that with one mouth and one spirit we may glorify God the Father in Jesus Christ, who is God blessed for ever. AMEN.

Calvin's Preface to the Antidote.

The name of Sacred Council is held in such reverence in the Christian Church, that the very mention of it produces an immediate effect not only on the ignorant but on men of gravity and sound judgment. And doubtless, as the usual remedy which God employed from the beginning in curing the diseases of his Church was for pious and holy pastors to meet, and, after invoking his aid, to determine what the Holy Spirit dictated, Councils are deservedly honoured by all the godly. There is this difference, however,—the vulgar, stupified with excessive admiration, do not afterwards make any use of their judgment, whereas those of sounder sense allow themselves, step by step, and modestly, indeed, but still allow themselves to inquire before they absolutely assent. And so it ought to be, in order that our faith, instead of rashly subscribing to the naked decisions of men, may submit to God only.

This is objected to by those who are persuaded, or at least would persuade others, that no Council whatever, provided it have been duly called, can err—inasmuch as it is guided by the Holy Spirit. Accordingly they insist that everything proceeding from it shall be received, like an oracle, without controversy. How much wiser is Augustine who, from his singular modesty, indeed bestows no small honour upon Councils, and yet ceases not to observe the moderation which I have described. Writing against the Arian, Maximinus, he says: "I ought neither to adduce the Council of Nice, nor you that of Ariminum, as if to prejudge the question. I am not determined by the authority of the latter, nor you by that of the former. Founding on the authority of Scripture not peculiar to either, but the common witness of both, fact contends with fact, plea with plea, reason with reason." So much liberty does this holy man concede to himself and others, that he will not allow the Council of Nice to operate as a previous judgment, unless the truth of the case be plainly established from Scripture.

But there is no occasion at present to dwell longer on these Ancient Councils. I have to treat of THE COUNCIL OF TRENT, which was of a very different description. When many corruptions were seen in the Church, when grave disputes on doctrine had arisen, a Council was long and ardently desired by many who hoped that by this means all evils would be ended. In this, indeed, they erred. For as matters are at present constituted, those possessed of any discernment easily perceive that no alleviation of evils is to be hoped from those who have the power of calling and holding a Council. Still as no better method appeared, very many persons not ill-disposed, who wished well to the Church, anticipated some good from a Council. Accordingly, being desired by many, it was at length demanded, as it were, by the common voice of Christendom.

Of the causes which delayed it for a considerable time, the more discerning are aware. For as to those causes which the Roman Pontiff alleges in his Bull, whosoever does not see them to be impudent fictions is more than blind. The causes which induced him to weave all possible delays, he himself best knows ; and yet we can in some measure conjecture. Some think he was afraid lest the Council might as a kind of vulgar thing be held cheap, both by princes and people, if it were at once so easily obtained. For long expectation, provided it does not tire out men's patience, usually adds a new value to things. I think, however, that there was a different reason. Although he knew that the Council which he would give would be nothing else than a hired crew of his own followers, among whom he himself alone would be eminent ; still, such is the power of an evil conscience, that he trembled at the very mention of a Council. For with such dissolute and unbridled license is the Papal tyranny exercised, that those who are most desirous to preserve it in being, have no doubt as to the necessity of curbing it. Hence, not without cause, he endeavoured by spinning out the time to escape from any diminution of his power. This afterwards appeared still more clearly ; for all the steps which he took in ordering his Council, contrary to the received custom, are so many proofs of the distrust which

I have mentioned. To omit an infinite number of other things, why were three legates sent but just that they might operate as mutual checks, and each prevent the other from attempting anything? In his own band, though they are all his sworn serfs, he found none whom he could trust.

Such were the private views of the Pope. A different view was taken by those who are unwilling that the present state of the Church, be it what it may, should be disturbed. They held that anything was better than to enter on a regular discussion of the subjects debated in the present day. Why so? Partly because it seems to them unbecoming to raise discussion, in any form, as to human decrees which have once been received; partly because violent possession delights them more than free government in any shape. For how few are those who now defend the Papacy under the pretext of zeal for the Church, who do not desire the liberty of the Christian people to be so crushed, that no one may dare a whisper about correcting the vices of the Church, or who do not clamour that a Council is needless, and that atrocious injustice is done to prior decisions, if they are not adhered to without any mention of a Council. What else is this, they ask, but to do what has been already done? And what license will be given in future to innovation and disturbance, if we do not acquiesce in things once decided? If the decisions already given are oracles of the Holy Spirit, what can be gained by new discussion? All this is easily refuted. Questions are agitated in the present day which were never before duly discussed; and it is plain that both the doctrine and the whole administration of the Papacy are so much at variance with the majority of ancient Councils, that nothing more opposite can be imagined. Moreover, the diseases under which the Church labours are so various and deadly, that at no period was it ever more necessary to hold a Council, if indeed there were any hope that a lawful Council could be obtained. It is apparent, therefore, that those who thus speak have not the least sense of true piety, but at ease, and almost with joy, contemplate the miserable distraction of the Church. Their assertion, that matters which have once been decided cannot again be lawfully agitated, is too absurd.

For in this view, wherein does the Holy Word of God differ from the decrees of man? If they would go back for their authorities to those purer ages which were distinguished for learning and piety, they might perhaps be listened to; but the Councils by whose decisions they wish to fetter us are those in which nothing but the grossest ignorance appears, united to barbarian ferocity. That this is strictly true will be made plain in its proper place. It furnishes the true reason for their talking so loudly of final judgments already pronounced.

Moreover, if hitherto there was any doubt how great the difference is between a Council and the tribunal of the Holy Spirit, from which there is no appeal, a striking illustration has been given us in THE COUNCIL OF TRENT. They contend that a Council cannot err, because it represents the Church. What if the latter position be denied to be true? But in order to determine the point we must, I presume, see who the men are that compose it. Perhaps forty Bishops or so are present. I do not keep to a number, nor much care about it, as it is of little consequence. Let the advocates of Councils answer me in good faith. Were any one to review them all in order, how many of them would he not condemn? Nay, when the venerable Fathers look in each other's faces, it must be impossible for them not to feel ashamed; for they know themselves, and are not ignorant of the opinion which they have of each other. Hence, if you take away the name of Council, the whole Papacy will confess that all the bishops who attended were nothing but dregs.

I am willing, however, to let other nations keep their ornaments untouched. I will only ask my French countrymen what price they set on the portion which they contributed? They doubtless hold the kingdom of France to be one of the leading branches of the Church. Why, then, it sent but two bishops, one from Nantes, and another from Clermont, both equally dull and unlearned. The latter was not long ago deemed as ridiculous as a buffoon, and so libidinous, that he was wont to track out dens of infamy with the scent of a pointer, till he placed himself under the discipline of a notorious Parisian, Sosia. After this he became suddenly wise, if men can so easily be made wise by a lady of the

school of Francis Picart. It is clear that the master is completely devoid of brains, belongs to the class of fanatics, and is little better than a madman. The Archbishop of Aix I scarcely count a Frenchman. He of Asti, however, as is usual with curious men, was present as an idle spectator. I ask you, my countrymen, who among you can persuade himself that anything which even a countless multitude of such men could have vented proceeded from the Holy Spirit? The two of whom I speak never had a taste of even the first rudiments of theology. How miserable, then, will the condition of the Christian Church be, if everything which pleased them, and a few no better than they, is to be held oracular! And yet very many are so thoughtless, that when they hear of the publication of the Decrees of the Holy Council, they reflect not that the authors of them are persons to whom they would not give the least credit in the paltriest question. Did this occur to them they would instantly reject with indignation and trample under foot what they now inconsiderately kiss. Why? Is there anything which their judgment approves? Not at all. But reverence for the Council blinds them. What folly, when you know the ass to tremble at his lion's skin!

But here it may be objected by the opposite party, that the decision did not rest with the bishops alone. I am aware. And this I particularly wished to observe. For there are certain garrulous and audacious monks, some of whom hunt after mitres, and others after cardinals' hats, while all of them sell their prattle to the Roman Pontiff. Let us assume, however, that they are excellent persons, and theologians of no common erudition. This, however, I know, that the venerable Fathers, on whose nod all religion depends, are preceded verbally by a set of sophists whose *dicta* they afterwards chant. What end then does it serve for them to mount a lofty seat, and then like demigods give out what a lower bench has dictated? Where is that representation of the Church to which they bind the Holy Spirit, if they are compelled precariously to borrow elsewhere what they need—if they would not be silent or speak in error? Your axiom is, that whatever be the meeting to which you

give the name of UNIVERSAL COUNCIL, there the Holy Spirit presides, and nothing can proceed from it that is not heavenly and divine. Meanwhile, you appoint hungry, venal-tongued monks, to whom this fancied spirit of yours must listen. They, in long and formal discussions, debate whatever is to be defined by the fathers: so I have heard; they keep quarrelling and croaking away like the frogs of Aristophanes. At length those famous decrees are concocted and afterwards given out as the responses of the Holy Spirit. And why should I misrepresent in a matter which is perfectly notorious? It is certain that there is no school so obscure as not to look down with contempt on anything coming from the theologians of Trent. What then? Shall we think that the moment they have changed their place, they receive a sudden afflatus, as if, like the priestesses of Apollo, they had entered the Delphian cauldron? Absurd! Were it to be announced to-day to the Sorbonne at Paris, that the Fathers of Trent differed in one iota from their decisions, the brains of its doctors would instantly warm, and they would rush forth to the combat. Not only would they set the authority of the Council at nought, but assail every man of them by name with the fiercest invectives. But here, if they give a white ball in support of their absurdest dreams, all the schools of France, Spain, Germany, and Italy will vie in applause. How dishonest then to obtrude and call upon the Christian world to worship that which they in their hearts utterly disregard!

But suppose we assume that those disputants who sweat in forging decrees are not only wondrously acute and learned, but are angels just come down from heaven; and suppose we also pardon our opponents the great absurdity of holding that a Council, which they proudly affirm to be guided by the immediate inspiration of the Spirit, goes a begging to a few individuals for that which it sends over the whole world as of divine origin—not even thus will the Council of Trent obtain a particle of credit. For nothing is determined there save at the nod of the Roman Pontiff. In future, then, let them have done with their bombast, that he who rejects the decrees of the Council fights not with men but with God

—that they are nothing but instruments, while he is the President who guides their minds and tongues by his Spirit. Were it so, I hold that they themselves insult the Holy Spirit by reprimanding him through their Pope, to whose decision and censure everything is subjected. I speak of what is perfectly notorious. As soon as any decree is framed, couriers flee off to Rome, and beg pardon and peace at the feet of their idol. The holy father hands over what the couriers have brought to his private advisers for examination. They curtail, add, and change as they please. The couriers return, and a sederunt is appointed. The notary reads over what no one dares to disapprove, and the asses shake their ears in assent. Behold the oracle which imposes religious obligations on the whole world! Why do they not openly confess the thing as it is—that ten or twenty monks, whose labours they have hired, concoct the decrees—that the Pope puts his censorial pen through whatever does not please him, and approves of the rest—that nothing is left to the Council but the burden of publishing? In ancient times, after the Roman Senate had deliberated, the plebeians examined; but the Pope, by no means contented with examining, arrogates right, moreover, to correct anything that does not please him in the deliberation of the Council. Presumptuously does he so act, if he thinks that the Holy Spirit is presiding there. We, however, I presume, may with impunity despise it, because we are aware of its being composed by such doctors, and corrected by such an Aristarchus. The proclamation of the Council is entitled to no more weight than the cry of an auctioneer.

But not to preface longer, should I, while trusting to the sure testimony of the Word of God, call the decrees of a Council in question, methinks I have proved that there is no reason why sober readers should charge me with presumption. But now, who that is not more than fatuous can be angry with me, when compelled by the necessity of maintaining the truth, I hesitate not to expose an ape though adorned with purple, and let all see him to be the ape he is? I have already amply shewn that those Neptunian fathers are not so formidable with their Trident as that one

may not boldly flagellate them with the Word of God, nor so sacred as to make it impious to touch them. But to my view that is not now the question. The mask which the Roman Pontiff has placed on the eyes of men is one by which no seeing man can be deceived. When, ten years ago, a Council was everywhere talked of, and the belief accordingly was, that the Pope could no longer by equivocation escape from collecting his flocks in good earnest, and bulls of citation had begun to fly about, I for my part conjectured that the summonses founded on the bulls would gradually go off into smoke. For I remembered another bull of Mantua, under the pontificate of Pius II., which, after much swelling talk, had instantly vanished. But if a Council were at length to be assembled, I considered with myself that the Roman Pontiff would use every means to dazzle the eyes of the simple with no ordinary splendour: and, to confess the truth, this thought made me exceedingly anxious. As to one thing there was no doubt, viz., that whoever should be allowed to sit and give their opinion, all of them, some ensnared by ambition, others blinded by avarice, others inflamed with rage, would be mortal enemies to sound doctrine, and being bound together in secret conspiracy to establish the tyranny of the Pope, would exert themselves to destroy the kingdom of Christ. There might, perhaps, be a very few unaffected by this cruel and impious feeling, but still without the manliness to resist it in others. I therefore immediately concluded, that under such unjust judges, the truth would be oppressed without being heard. For it was not even to be hoped that any one pious and right-hearted man would venture, at the expense of his life, to purchase one hour's audience. Meanwhile many unskilful, though otherwise honest persons would be imposed upon, by the plausible axiom that the decision of the Church must be acquiesced in. Thanks to the Pope for furnishing us with a display which our very children will hold in derision! I ask nothing of my readers, however, but to lay prejudice in favour of either party aside, and come unbiassed to the discussion. This they can only do by withdrawing their eye from persons, and fixing it on the subject.

On the Prefatory Discourse by the Legates in the First Session, and other Preliminary Matters of the Council.

It is well! At length the Romanists confess, that the fearful distraction of the Church at present, which all good men deplore, is in a great measure attributable to themselves. Any one, not very shrewd, on hearing this candid confession, will forthwith conceive good hopes. And the exhortations which follow exhibit no ordinary zeal for the renovation of the Church. Thus, that part in which they declare that none can succour their falling affairs save Christ the only Shepherd, that therefore they must implore and listen to him alone; that all will go prosperously if he guides all their actions and presides over them; that all other counsels, other arts, are but leaky cisterns which let out water; that the wisdom of man does nought but further provoke the anger of God, and increase evils rather than cure them—of all that part, I say—how strongly it breathes of piety! But it is apparent from the acts which followed, that those were vain words given to the winds. Nay, they do not wait till a judgment is formed from their acts. For in regard to the doctrine of salvation, which they have wholly adulterated by their impious and abominable fictions; in regard to the sacraments which they have utterly vitiated, and which they prostitute to a vile and shameless trafficking, they find nothing in themselves to correct. How little aid, then, do they bring to ruined affairs! And truly we can expect nothing from the Tridentines who serve under Neptune but what is of a watery nature, when the business to be undertaken is the Reformation of the Church. But when persecution is to rage against the innocent, and impious tyranny is to be confirmed by the blood of the godly, they at once blaze into flame. Indeed, something resembling this may be seen within the realm of Neptune, when with roaring noise he lashes the waves into foam. Soon, however, it bursts by its

own tumescence, and the uproar immediately subsides. They, in like manner, as soon as the smoke has cleared away from their forehead, shew without disguise what the nature of their conduct is to be in regard to the principal head. They are to cling with a death-grasp to all their impieties, while we who desire nothing but the reign of Christ, and maintain the pure doctrine of the Gospel, are to be judged heretics. For thus, before cognisance is taken, they declare all heretical who have dared at this time to move a whit against the received doctrine of the Roman Church. What is this? The whole Christian world was in expectation of a Council in which controverted points might be regularly discussed. These men avow that they sit for no other end than to condemn whatever is not to their mind. Therefore, let no man any longer deceive himself: From their own mouths we hear that this pompous Council is held not for inquiry, but to establish that kind of doctrine, be it what it may, with which monks and sophists have imbued the world; that all rites shall remain by whatever superstition they may have crept in; and all the fetters of conscience be drawn into a tighter knot.

Can any one still be so stupid as to think of seeking any alleviation of our evils from a Council? We complain that the whole doctrine of godliness is adulterated by impious dogmas; that the whole worship of God is vitiated by foul and disgraceful superstitions; that the pure institution of the sacraments has been supplanted by horrible sacrilege; that their use has been converted into a profane trafficking; that poor souls, which ought to have been ruled by the doctrine of Christ, are oppressed by cruel bondage; that nothing is seen in the Christian Church that is not deformed and debased; that the grace of Christ not only lies half-buried, but is partly torn to pieces, partly altogether extinguished. All these complaints, which we have made for many years, and in published books, and which we make in our daily sermons, we are prepared to prove well founded, whenever a freedom of utterance is given. Such is the goodness of our cause, that it does not at all fear the light. And many are the tens of thousands so firmly persuaded of it, that

they desired no farther investigation. Still, lest the Christian world might lay aside dissension, and unite in holy concord, a Council is summoned. Ought not its members to have discussed controverted points before they prejudged either themselves or others? They allow nothing of the kind. Nay, should any one have attempted to change one tittle of their customs, they hold him as already condemned.

Behold the specious Reformation, with the promise of which they have hitherto amused the world! The many portentous idolatries by which the Church of God is deformed—the many defilements of superstitions—the many profanations of sacred things—the vast sink of errors must not be touched. There is to be no diminution of the tyrannical yoke of impious laws by which miserable consciences have been ensnared; but all who desire any change are to be judged heretics. Where is that hearing which many were simple enough to promise themselves? If religion had any hold of their minds, nay, if they had any belief of a God, would they so confidently, and, as it were, in jest, skip over matters of so much moment? The glory of God is in question, the everlasting kingdom of Christ, the safety of the whole Church. They are compelled, in compliance so far with the common wishes of the Christian people, to hold a Council. They, however, premise, that they come for the very purpose of cutting off all hope of reform. For these words are the same in effect as if they had plainly and distinctly declared that the future would be no better than the past. And yet in thus acting they exhibit nothing foreign to their character. For in the overthrow of piety and the corruptions of sacred things, which in the present day all good men deplore, there is nothing of which those men who sit as judges do not deserve the blame. Do we wonder, then, if, while they themselves are the accused parties, they proceed forthwith, without touching the cause, to pass sentence in their own favour? It is more than absurd to leave the power of judging to those whose criminality is under discussion. And yet, what do they gain, but just to make all who have eyes aware that they do not in the least repent of their

crimes while they pertinaciously defend everything of which we accuse them? They will not succeed, however, in getting a sanction to their impiety, because they are themselves obstinate.

Some one will now ask, What then do they hold forth as the benefits to be derived from a Council? To put an end to wars among Christian princes and give tranquillity to the Church. Folly! For who knows not that the Romanists are bellows which fan the flame of warlike commotions wherever their blast is applied? The only thing remaining, therefore, is to restore lapsed discipline, especially in their own clergy. With what faith they have exerted themselves in this direction is apparent from their acts; for they there, as we shall see, open up a way by which everything which has been allowed in time past is to be allowed in future. But to prevent it being thought that after all this costly show nothing has been done, there will, perhaps, be some reformation in caps and shoes, and other parts of dress. While they in this way mock God and men, they are not ashamed to personate the Prophets, as if the three Legates of Antichrist were the three intercessors of whom Ezekiel speaks, who first threw themselves into the breach to appease the anger of God. They make an humble confession of sins—they mention groans and tears, the signs of repentance. I believe the person employed as their reader on this occasion must have found it difficult to keep from laughing.

But while they wish to act as players, one expression escapes from them, which I think should be regarded as a divine prediction; for, like Caiaphas of old, what is to prevent the enemies of Christ from prophesying? They declare that the Holy Spirit is not present with them if they do not accuse themselves; they say that he will not be present so long as they refuse to listen to their sins. I receive the oracle. Afterwards, indeed, to give eclat to their assembly, they falsely state that they see tears. But while the case itself proclaims that they remained obstinate in establishing the kingdom of impiety, we believe, according to their prediction, that nothing governed them less than the Holy Spirit. And who sees not that they were

forced, against their inclination, by the secret impulse of God, as if they had been put to the question, to make this confession? They adduce Ezekiel as a witness, who declares that God will not answer the people if they do not first acknowledge their own abominations and those of their fathers. Where, then, is such an acknowledgment on their part? Let them be silent, then, or confess that they send forth the figments of their own brain at random. But if I have not yet convinced all men of this, at least let the reader remember, that when we come to discussion, truth itself must decide whether their decrees proceeded from the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Formerly they gave out, that all decisions of a Council were, without exception, divine responses. Now, God has extorted this confession from them as if they had been malefactors on the wheel. Whether the Spirit of God presided over the Council must be decided by this test—Did they condemn their own and their fathers' abominations, and turn to true repentance? Let any one who would not be voluntarily deceived try the following canons by this rule. If I do not make it clearer than day that there was not a whit more of repentance in them than in the worst of the Israelites, let it be, as they insist, that it was the voice of God, and not of man. Therefore, as they choose to compare their crew with Ezra, Nehemiah, and the other leaders of the ancient people, and say, by the mouth of their reader, that in the spirit of sorrow they duly lamented their own sins and those of the people, let them, I say, be forgiven for their insolence in putting an atrocious affront on the holy servants of God, by comparing them to a filthy herd of swine, and let them with dry eyes impudently boast of their tears; for what is it that they may not do? Still they cannot deprive us of the liberty of forming our decision from facts rather than words. Herein, indeed, they are very ridiculous. After declaring that they have abundantly wept over their sins in godly sorrow, they exhort themselves and others to open fountains of tears. The rhetorician must surely have been oblivious when he composed this declaration for them: or what if he wished to expose them to derision, as they deserved? The latter may

be the true explanation, but I pass it as a matter with which I have no concern.

It were irksome to follow out every single point, nor is it necessary; for they so mingle praise and exhortation, that there is nothing in either but fiction and sheer falsehood. When they accuse our churches of expelling their pastors, substituting laymen in their stead, confounding orders, plundering ecclesiastical property, impeding the course of the word of God, our answer to their accusations is at hand. First, they give the name of pastors to those of whose expulsion they complain. How long will this title be usurped by men who have nothing pastoral but the badge of a silver staff? The confounding of orders which they deplore is nothing else than a moderate restoration of discipline. They insist that they themselves shall be counted sacred in consequence of having been anointed. Fortified with this privilege, they hold that their vices connot be touched. Hence, provided they may do as they please, everything will be duly ordered. If this sacred order is violated, all things are in their judgment as much confounded as if the heavens were falling. As to the plundering of property, I wish our people were as well prepared to give satisfaction to God as we are to make a candid and true defence against our accusers. That idle-bellies have been deprived of the means which they were swallowing up, I admit. Let us see whether anything was taken by robbery from the Church. It is certain that that which the venerable Legates now dedicate to the Church had been seized by robbers. It is certain that it was not only spent in stuffing their gullet, but basely squandered on debauchery, gaming, theatrical indecencies, and in other ways not a whit better. The poor were neglected. They more frequently squeezed something out of the teachers of schools than aided them with salaries. Now, on the other hand, if the administration is not yet so pure and holy as were to be wished, at least godly pastors are maintained to feed souls with the doctrine of salvation; something is expended on schools; the poor have ten times more distributed to them than they used to get. Some portion also is bestowed on other uses, neither profane nor

liable to censure. See why they charge our adherents with plunder! But what have I to say to the charge of impeding the course of the word of God? It is a very serious charge. I am altogether at a loss how to meet it. Nefarious extinguishers of pure doctrine! dare you impute to us the very sacrilege of which you are guilty before God and his angels and the whole world? Yet I wonder not that they spoke so in such a meeting—a meeting to which they knew nothing would be palatable but what was villanously said.

But there were other monitors whose business it was to correct any omission or error of the Legates. There are extant some speeches delivered by monks who, we are to believe, were a kind of channels through which the Holy Spirit flowed out of the mouths of the fathers. There is also one by a bishop, I know not who, than which nothing can be imagined more absurd. The sum of the whole is, that we are to be put down by brief decisions, because it must remain a settled point, that before our friends appeared everything in their doctrine was good and pure. Because Isaiah promises that the Lord will be a wall and rampart to Jerusalem, one Sotus (which in French means stupid and fatuous) devises a twofold bulwark for the Church—one of divine, and another of human laws; and in this foolish imagination he exults as if he were heading a magnificent triumph over us. Could I lose labour and time in hunting down such a creature? To me it is more than enough to have pointed to it with the finger. Because cities are fortified with a wall and rampart, the Lord declares that he alone will serve for both. But the interpretation of Sotus transfers the rampart to human laws, and teaches that the ruins of the Church cannot be restored in any other way than by filling up the breach which we have made.

Another, named Marinarius, exhales smoke from his Carmelite kitchen, and says that our gospel liberty is a pretext for all kinds of corruption; and to give his oration a sprinkling of elegance, he exclaims,—O, impure and vile! Although they have no shame, they will not dare to deny that vice stalks among them with greater freedom than with us. That with us, assuredly, there is more real and chaste

severity and a stricter discipline, our daily sermons testify; and yet this dog, just emerged from the mire of a fetid cloister, is not ashamed thus to bark at us. But, after abolishing vows, throwing off celibacy, contemning holy prayers, treading fasting under our feet, and rejecting the customs of our fathers, we have seized on the opportunity of sinning as the leading principle of our life! What kind of life, then, did the Apostles lead? They knew nothing of the celibacy for which the Papists contend; under them there was no mention of vows; they laid no burden on the conscience as to the choice of meats. Contented with the rule which their Lord had prescribed, they attempted not to fetter any by laws and traditions. There is nothing of which we are calumniously accused which might not be equally charged against the Apostles. The kind of vows of which we disapprove is evident from our writings. Into what a sink of impurity the whole world has been plunged by their celibacy, which we desire to change for holy marriage, is but too well known. When Paul censured celibacy in younger widows, his reason was because some of them had gone over to Satan. At the present day it is well ascertained that there is more obscenity in the cloisters of monks and nuns than in common dens of infamy. Wherever priests penetrate they leave some impress of their unchastity; as if they had been prohibited from marriage solely for the purpose of giving free scope to their lust in any quarter. And shall all this experience not have the effect of inducing us to relieve them from the necessity of celibacy? He falsely asserts that we condemn Christian fasting and holy prayer; but he does it securely, because he knew that he would receive the more applause the more bacchanalian rage he vented against us. Meanwhile, this worthy vindicator of gospel liberty describes all the servile superstitions of the papacy as its proper fruits, solace, delight, and nourishment! It is strange he did not also call them celestial nectar and ambrosia! What can you make of an animal like this? Paul teaches that Christian liberty consists in the free use of things indifferent; and though, as is becoming, he makes the external use subordinate to charity, he allows no fetters to be laid on the

conscience, and carefully admonishes us to beware of being entangled with the yoke of bondage. This gentle son of Venus (for both his names smack of the sea) affirms that liberty will not be safe unless it be buried under an infinite load of laws and ceremonies; and at length exclaims, that we execrate the approved sayings of the fathers, the sacraments, the honour due to saints, and all that is sacred. By these fictions Papists were formerly wont to stir up the blinded populace against us. Now, it is easy to infer what opinion they have of each other, when this illiberal license of lying catches applause in their most sacred convention.

In what respect, pray, do we impair the honour of the saints, unless it be in forbidding idols to be made of them? Is it honour to the saints to rob God of his honour and transfer it to them, that they may be worshipped promiscuously with God? They will deny that they do so, by bringing in their distinction of *dulia* and *latria*. An excellent method, forsooth, of avoiding idolatry when they distinguish between kinds of worship altogether similar by employing two vocables, just as horses in a stall are kept separate by their tethers. Meanwhile, they allow the saints to be worshipped indifferently with God. What is it that the prophets everywhere condemn in the people of Israel, but just that they give incense to their idols, provide sacred feasts, pay gifts, dedicate altars, and prostrate themselves before them? In all these things the Papists go beyond the Israelites. For they kindle lamps and tapers at the dead images of the dead, sprinkle incense, celebrate their memory in solemn feasts, place them on altars, make oblations to them, carry them about on their shoulders in procession, undertake long pilgrimages to visit them, bow down before them and pray to them. Nay, illiterate females and almost all the peasantry, in praying to Hugo and Lubin, use the very form of prayer which was given us by the Son of God. Thus a block of wood will be our Father in heaven. So far is any one from opposing this horrid sacrilege, that priests and monks sing out, Well done! Well done! And it is made a serious charge against us that we have studied to purify the holy worship of God from all these profanations. Hence we

are styled enemies of all that is sacred! And yet no new thing has happened to us; for the same was said of the Prophets and Apostles.

I say nothing of those charges which will be better discussed in their own place. Only there is one which ought not to be omitted, viz., that all we aim at is under the pretext of the primitive and apostolic Church, to set up the carnal daughter of old Adam and the spouse of Satan, instead of a pious Reformation, is to introduce confusion into the Christian commonwealth, and procure license for all kinds of vice; and to leave us no defence, he adds, that all this has been proved by the event. What kind of Church we long for, God well knows and is our witness, while numerous proofs bear ample testimony to the world. A judgment cannot be more truly or rightly formed than from our doctrine and the case itself. Let any one, who will, compare our writings with theirs, and then let him turn his eye and survey the reality. I say nothing more than that it will at once be plain how just our grounds are for bewailing the destruction of the Church, and calling for the restitution of its fallen state; and how in prescribing the method we mingle nothing of carnal prudence or zeal, but refer all our feelings, counsels, wishes, and endeavours to the true and only rule. What agreement or affinity is there between their whole hierarchy which they proudly extol, and the government of Christ and the Apostles? Nay, in what point are they not utterly opposed to each other? But we must pardon Marinarius, who, while he beholds the faces of the Fathers of Trent, is ravished with admiration at the splendid sight, and thinks he sees and hears Christ. Hence, it is not strange that the man in his ecstasy sends forth torrents of froth instead of words! He says: While I contemplate you, Fathers, preeminent in ecclesiastical dignity, and distinguished for all kinds of learning, you the lights and ornaments of the world, methinks I see Christ walking on the water, and also hear him saying, Fear not: it is I! The reason why he inveighs so fiercely against us is because we set no more value on that divine splendour of the Council of Trent, at which he gazes in amazement, than on a children's show. In

what terms shall I rebuke his sordid adulation? But anything from a Carmelite scarcely deserves rebuke, since the world has long been accustomed not to require anything like ingenuousness in that begging fraternity.

Next, Ambrosius Catharinus, of the order of the Dominicans, the old antagonist of Luther, blows out his cheeks. I thought that under the confusion to which he was put twenty years ago, he had gone into some obscure corner to hide himself. So disgracefully was he prostrated by Luther, when yet a young soldier, so thoroughly was he hissed by the consent of all classes, that if he were wise he would never have appeared again in public. But now, I presume, aroused by the published bull of the Council, as if a jubilee had been proclaimed, he again comes to light a kind of new man. He is the same, however, as before. Those who formerly read the absurdities of Catharinus would not know that that putrid carcase is still breathing, did they not read his harangues delivered in the Council, in which the mother of Christ is called his most faithful associate, and represented as sitting on his throne to obtain grace for us! Many before him have given loose reins to their impudence, but none I believe was found, while seeking to deck the blessed Virgin with fictitious titles, to call her the associate of Christ. And that this blasphemous expression was uttered in such an assembly, and received with no small favour, posterity never would have believed had not the oration been published. What is meant by dividing Christ, if this is not? Therefore, when he says that she has been appointed by God to be our advocate, it is just equivalent to saying that half of what the Apostles declare of Christ is applicable to her. And this fellow dares to compare himself to Simeon, though the venerable old man had his whole soul intent on the one salvation of God, even not yet revealed, whereas to Catharinus Christ is only one among a crowd of advocates. After making this beautiful arrangement in heaven, he descends to the terrestrial hierarchy, and declares that whoso refuses to submit to Paul III. is an alien from the body of Christ! What! even though he hold a primacy only like that of the devil among his angels?

He says, that he who holds the See of Rome cannot but be the Vicar of Christ. Are these triflers not yet ashamed to sport their futile inanities, which they know to have been refuted a thousand times to weariness? At the period when there was still a Church and a bishopric at Rome, there was no mention of any such primacy as the Romanists now arrogate to themselves. To Christ alone belongs the universal bishopric, while each single pastor, as Cyprian tells us, possesses part of the undivided whole. The appellation of Universal Bishop, if conferred on a man, Gregory everywhere testifies to be blasphemous, nefarious, accursed, and the forerunner of Antichrist. What! were the Africans cut off from the body of Christ when they would not even concede the title of first or highest bishop to the bishop of Rome? Did Cyprian discard himself from the communion of the Church, when he not only called Stephen the Roman bishop to order, and taught him to be docile to his colleagues, but charged him with error, ignorance, and mulish obstinacy? Was Jerome the author of schism from the flock of Christ, when he declared that no bishop was made superior by the pride of riches, nor inferior by the humility of poverty,—whether he were the bishop of Rome or of Eugubium? But though with one assent the Roman See were raised to the third heaven, how ridiculous is it to make a primate of bishops of one who is no more like a bishop than a wolf is like a lamb! It is little to say that there is nothing episcopal in him, but while he is the declared enemy of Christ and the Church, it is surely too much to insist on our acknowledging him to be also The Vicar of Christ? At present, however, it is not our purpose to carry this discussion farther. It is better to consult our books on this subject. The words of Catharinus himself remind us that we must not stay longer here. For after swearing that the last thing he would do would be to curry favour by flattery, he immediately adds, —"But to the subject,"—intimating that he had wandered and spoken away from the subject. It is hopeless, however, to expect that he will bring us back to the subject, unless he previously return to a sound mind.

If we may judge a lion by his claws, our readers now have

the means of knowing what they ought to think of the Council of Trent. For it is to be supposed, that of the monks present, those to whom chiefly the task of discoursing was given, were deemed the first and as it were the flower. Let it be understood that they are also the persons who concocted the Canons, and dictated to the horned Fathers what they, like dumb persons, were to approve by a silent nod. To what have we fallen! Are we to give the honour of Divine oracles to whatever such creatures might growl with obstreperous voice into other ears? Although I am not so ignorant of matters as to believe that the orations published in their name, be they what they may, were their own composition; for they have their speech-makers, to whom they hand their absurdities, and get them glossed over with some colour of words, lest even children should laugh! But let us assume that the whole was polished by their own industry, still it is a great point gained to have such a specimen of the awful wisdom of the Papacy.

We must not pass over some bishop or other named Cornelius, who, as he surpassed his superiors in dignity, far surpasses them also in folly. Had there been anything like gravity and seriousness in the Acts of the Council, one might have said that the part assigned to him was that of the fool in the play; but there is no doubt that he was a chosen one among the bishops, though the whole flower of the order was displayed; and therefore I only say, that if they were not sorry for him and ashamed of him, I very much pity them. Their eyes indeed may have been dazzled by one circumstance—his gathering flowers from every quarter, and thrusting into his oration every elegant expression he had ever learnt, that he might pass himself off as an orator. And I for one am perfectly willing that he should think himself most eloquent, and seem so to his party. He must, indeed, have been very familiar with Cicero, from whom he with so much confidence borrows patches of sentences, which he huddles into his discourse. But that, while thus playing the buffoon, he should employ his borrowed garrulity to oppress the kingdom of Christ and profane Scripture at will, is not on any account to be borne. It were an endless work

to specify every point, but the reader may take the following as a specimen. The joyous orator, after pouring upon his audience his threefold joy, congratulates himself and his associates that they now see with their eyes and handle with their hands that blessed hope which many desired to see but were not able. These words once spoken, partly of the former advent of Christ, and partly of the final revelation for which we still look, what pious man can, without indignation, hear transferred by this madman to such a sink as Trent? And that nothing might be wanting to crown his impudence, he tags to it a third clause from the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, on the final perfection of believers.

After this prelude, what might he not think himself at liberty to do? Accordingly, he hesitates not to strip Christ in order that he may deck his Pope with the spoils. The Pope, he says, came a light into the world. Blasphemous mouth! will you apply to that fetid monster of yours sacred terms applicable to none but the Son of God? Had you believed in a God, must not the very sound of your nefarious voice have struck you with sudden horror and amazement? Had there been any feeling of piety in that famous Council, must not this great profanation of Scripture, and more especially this insult to the Son of God, have inflamed all with indignation? And will they still pretend that the Holy Spirit presides where our Redeemer is with such impunity mocked? For what is more peculiar to Christ than the honour which the evangelist renders to him when, excluding the Baptist by name, or rather under his name excluding all mortals, he asserts of Christ alone, and proclaims that the Son of God came as our light from heaven? It is one of those sentences which must produce the highest reverence in all pious minds. The Council, however, receive it as if it were mere gaudy verbiage. What words of rebuke could be strong enough for such impiety? But it is well that my readers have no need of many words to form a just estimate of it; for which reason I shall merely glance at the remainder.

When he breaks forth in praise of Paul III., one would say that he has drawn his water from a full fountain, there

is such a flow of words. He is, he says, the bravest and best in the memory of man; he will be celebrated by the tongues of all nations; no age will be silent in his praise! He had read these things in Cicero. He thought them elegantly expressed—as indeed they are—provided they be aptly applied. How well they apply to Paul III. let the consciences even of those who are most devoted to his tyranny bear witness. I were more than foolish were I to detail the encomiums in the thundering out of which this trifler exercises his lungs. After saying that he was preserved by the wondrous providence of God to bless us with his faith, wisdom, and power, he bids the venerable Fathers, as sitting on a kind of tripod, exclaim, Long life to the Holiest—Long life to the Œcumenical—Long life to the Apostolical! O good father, how much better were it for you to be a man of sense than to sing out your *vivat* in favour not only of a dead man, but of a fatal pestiferous monster! As to your proclaiming him worthy of heaven, I don't know if you are aware of the universal belief that he was unworthy of the earth! Here you certainly made a most grievous mistake; you ought to have assigned him a station far removed from heaven. Of the remaining bundle of praises with which this elegant eulogist loads his idol, I will only say this much: He had perhaps heard the old adage, Praise is a pleasant song—but mistook its meaning. Accordingly, that he might shew himself a pleasant orator, his whole oration is devoted to praise. He next passes to the Council; and of the three Legates makes one a celestial, viz., Cardinal de Monti, whom all know to be truculent in temper and rude in manners; the second he makes a strict exacter of Christian policy, (I wish he would begin with his own bed-chamber!) and the third he makes an angel, (I wish he would lay aside his ambition, a principal part of the flesh!) At length the Council appears to him like the New Jerusalem, and what not. This no doubt was in compliance with the grave obtestation of the Legates, that no man should be praised. But the amusing part is, that though he intended to say all these things, he deprecates their indignation. Let none of you, he says, be offended with me; for better are the wounds

of a friend than the treacherous kisses of an enemy. They must surely be cruel, ravenous beasts if such soft handling irritates them. What would they do under harder provocation?

Afterwards, as if he had appeased them, he gives way to exultation, exclaiming, We came, and saw, and conquered! Cæsar indeed might thus boast. But how ridiculous are these pæans in the shade of the valley of Trent, out of sight of an enemy! I should like to know what they saw to conquer? But I am afraid he may charge me with misrepresenting; since he immediately adds the reason, viz., that the gates of the Council being opened, the gates of heaven were opened also, as if it were not palpable to all how wide the difference is between heaven and the Council. But we must pardon a delirious man when he wanders out of bounds. He next congratulates them on the restoration of the Church, which was nodding to destruction, when the new light of God, and of him who makes the nearest approach to God—Paul III.—arose! What! is Paul III. superior to angels, and Prophets, and Apostles? I see how it is. He had read that Cicero (whom he imitates not quite so well as a monkey does a man) had on one occasion thus flattered the Roman people, and he was unwilling to lose the fine sentence. Meanwhile, what pious mind does not abominate such blasphemy?

Who can say that the Spirit was absent from a Council which was blown up by such bellows? And yet this bishopling does make a glowing harangue about the clemency of Paul III. and the Fathers. For he declares that Paul, forgetful of himself, and mindful of us, aimed solely at what was humane and fatherly. We will believe that the mind of Paul was thus mild, whenever it shall appear that he forgot himself. This colouring, however, is far more tolerable than the cruel instigation of a rhetorician, I say not who, (for from respect I suppress his name.) Afraid, perhaps, that the men of Trent would not be bold enough in issuing sanguinary decrees, he exhorts them to dare, and promises that the moment they order, hands will be ready to execute. Is it thus that you, who are not ignorant of their disposition, and ought rather, if conscience had any weight with you, to have

exposed your own head—is it thus that to subject the innocent to unworthy treatment, you hesitate not to whet the fury of men already possessed by cruel and brutish rage? Has the Italian air so debased all your feelings, as to make you forget that the Son of God, whose cause is discussed, will one day be a just Judge? Have you forgotten how great value he sets upon his kingdom, which is comprehended under the preaching of the Word? Do you not bear in mind how strict an avenger he declares himself to be, when his Father's glory is infringed? By what figures of rhetoric will you efface the fearful judgments which he fulminates against perfidious dissimulation? What madness has so blinded you, that you fear not to trample under foot the sacred blood of martyrs, which he declares, and not in vain declares, to be precious in his sight? Does not this single sentence strike you with terror,—Woe to those who call light darkness? I tremble on your account, while I think of that fearful vengeance which must shortly overtake you, if you return not to the right path. I therefore spare you not, in order that God may spare. But so it is. The tongues of rhetoricians must become meretricious when they begin to speak for hire. But if they are so eloquent in cursing, we must not be dumb in repressing their virulence. It were base cowardice if, while they pour all possible opprobrium on the memory of the martyrs, (which the Lord hath with his own lips declared would be blessed among the righteous,) we should tamely allow it; it were flagitious perfidy if, while they defame the eternal truth of God, we should in a manner betray it by our silence! But let us now come to the decree of the Second Session, as the first act of the play.

DECREE PUBLISHED IN THE SECOND SESSION OF THE HOLY COUNCIL OF TRENT.

7th January 1546.

The Holy Council of Trent lawfully met in the Holy Spirit, under the presidency of the three foresaid Legates of the Apostolic See, acknowledging, with the blessed Apostle James, that every good and perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of Lights, who to all who ask wisdom of him, giveth liberally, and upbraideth not; and knowing, also, that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, hath determined and decreed that all and each of the faithful in Christ, assembled in the city of Trent, are to be exhorted, as the Council hereby exhorts them, to turn aside from the evil and sins they have hitherto committed, and walk henceforth in the fear of the Lord, and not fulfil the desires of the flesh; to be instant in prayer, frequent in confession, take the sacrament of the Eucharist, attend the churches, in short, accomplish the commandments of the Lord, (as far as each may be enabled,) and likewise pray in private every day for the peace of Christian rulers, and the unity of the Church; that Bishops, moreover, and all others in priests' orders, assisting at the Œcumenical Council in this city, make it their business to engage diligently in the praises of the Lord, offering victims, praises, and prayers, and perform the sacrifice of the Mass, at least every Lord's Day, (on which God made the light, and rose again from the dead, and imparted the Holy Spirit to his disciples,) offering up, as the Holy Spirit enjoins by the Apostle, supplications, prayers, requests, and thanksgivings, for our most holy lord the Pope, for the Emperor, for kings, and others who are in authority, and for all men, that we may lead a quiet and tranquil life, enjoy peace, and see an increase of faith. The

Council, moreover, exhorts them to fast, at least every Friday, in memory of our Lord's passion, and bestow alms on the poor. Moreover, in the cathedral church, let there be a Mass of the Holy Spirit celebrated every Thursday, with the litanies and other prayers thereunto appointed; and in the other churches, on the same day, let at least litanies and prayers be said. And during the time of Divine service, let there be no speaking and gossiping, but let the minister be accompanied with mouth and mind.

And seeing that bishops must be blameless, sober, chaste, ruling their own houses well, the Council also exhorts every one above all things to observe sobriety and moderation at table; and as there idle talk usually begins, to have the Holy Scriptures read at their tables, each teaching and training those of his household not to be quarrelsome, drunken, unchaste, covetous, heady, slanderous, and lovers of pleasures, in short, to shun vice, and embrace virtue; and as regards dress and behaviour, let them study comeliness in all their actions, as befit the ministers of God.

Moreover, seeing that the principal care, solicitude, and aim of this Holy Council is to drive away the darkness of the heresies which have for so many years covered the land, and with the aid of Jesus Christ, who is the true light, to make the light of Catholic truth shine again in all its brightness and purity, and to reform those things which need reformation, the Council exhorts all Catholics here met and to meet, and especially those skilled in sacred literature, to consider diligently with themselves by what ways and means the intention of the Council may be directed, so as best to obtain the wished for result, that thus things worthy of condemnation may be more quickly and advisedly condemned, and those worthy of approval approved, and all men throughout the world may with one voice and the same confession of faith glorify God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

And while the priests sitting in the place of benediction give their opinions, agreeably to the Canon of the Council of Toulouse, let none use immoderate expressions, or act tumultuously, let none contend with false, vain, or obstinate disputation, but let all be said in the mildest terms, that nei-

ther may the hearers be offended, nor the edge of judgment be blunted by perturbation of mind.

Moreover, the Sacred Council has resolved and decreed, that if it shall happen that any sit in a place not duly belonging to them, and give their vote by using the word *placet*, and take part in the meetings, and do any other acts whatsoever during the Council, none shall thereby suffer prejudice, none acquire new rights.

On the Decree of the Second Session.

As they know that the name of Council is held in honour, they use it for the purpose of procuring respect to themselves from good men, to whom they are unknown; for while they keep using such swelling words as Sacred, Œcumenical, and Universal Council, lawfully met in the Holy Spirit, they dazzle the eyes of the simple. But as it is a part of Christian modesty to reverence the authority of the Church, so it is the part of prudence to take heed that Satan do not delude us by a fallacious pretext. Here, indeed, there is no necessity for such careful prudence; for we have not to guard against spiritual imposture, or some more hidden subtlety. Let us only open our eyes, and we shall see that what they clothe in such splendid titles is nothing. When they published this Canon, perhaps twenty bishops were present. This is what they call an Universal Council, and the more to overawe the ignorant, they use a Greek term, as if an unknown word were to have the power of a magical charm! But what is meant by calling it an Œcumenical Council? It is the same as if it were said that all the bishops throughout the habitable globe had flocked to Trent. Had it been only a Provincial Council they should have been ashamed of the fewness of its members. Why, then, or on what ground shall we regard this as a Holy Council? How

long, pray, will they think that they are dealing with children, and can add to their dignity by pomposities fit only to excite laughter? How can they make us believe that they are duly met in the Holy Spirit, unless it be that they were summoned by bull? As if they held men's minds fascinated by the absurd idea, that the Holy Spirit is brought down from heaven by the nod of a Pope. At the time when those Councils were held, to which they themselves are obliged to give pre-eminence, the Roman bishop did not possess the right of calling them. The Emperor, along with others, summoned them by his edict. That this was the case not only with what are called the four great Councils, but also with very many others, is attested by ancient acts still extant, and by all history. Let them not here allege that the validity of such summoning was questionable. This is disproved by the letters of Leo, in which he humbly begs the Emperors Theodosius, Valentinian, and Marcion, that they would be pleased, of their imperial authority, to intimate a day and place for the bishops. Gregory long after begged the same of Mauricius.

But, perhaps, the three Legates of the Apostolic See brought the Holy Spirit. If so, the Council of Nice was not duly assembled, since it only gave the Legates of the Roman Church the fourth place. What is to be said of the Council of Aquila, which, though it was held in Italy, and was a general Council, makes no mention of the Roman bishop? If a Council is not duly constituted unless the Legates of the Pope preside, what answer will the African bishops give who assigned the last place to Philip and Asellus, the two Legates of Boniface, because they were only presbyters and not of the episcopal order? Now, if a deacon of the Roman Church is only distinguished by a red cloak, he will carry his head over those of all the bishops. However, it is of no consequence to me what rank each of them holds. I will give them no trouble on that head. Nay, I will readily allow the mitres to be vanquished by the hats, provided they do not bind the Holy Spirit to their masks of recent invention, and maintain, that wherever the purple glare is seen, the Council is duly assembled. But if they lay down this as the law,

why do they refuse to hold the Council at Basle to have been a lawful Council? Who can tolerate the insolent pretence, that a man can send forth the Spirit and recall him when he pleases? If they would convince us by a sound argument that the Spirit of God is their President, they must first prove that they are assembled in the name and under the auspices of Christ.

Their acts proclaim that it is far otherwise. First, their lofty preamble is not followed up by anything worthy of the occasion; and, secondly, as soon as they enter upon business, the very best they have is drawn from the veriest dregs of superstition. At the very commencement, how flat and lifeless they are, and devoid of all spiritual energy in their first Canon, I will leave to the judgment of my readers. There is no man possessed of moderate intelligence who does not see this for himself. It is sufficient to touch on what follows. One simple fact will enable us to give judgment. They exhort the bishops and priests holding the Council, in other words, themselves, to perform the sacrifice of the Mass at least every Lord's day. Behold the beginning of their famous Reformation! We loudly maintain that the sacrifice of the Mass is nothing else than an impious profanation of the Lord's Supper. This we make plain by the clear words of our Lord. For in instituting the sacred Supper, he does not enjoin us to sacrifice, but invites us to partake of the sacrifice which he himself once offered. He commands distribution to be made, and orders all alike to communicate in both symbols. And there is no obscurity in the words; Take, distribute among yourselves; drink ye all of this cup. What resemblance is there between the observance which corresponds to our Lord's command and the Papal Mass, in which they pretend that Christ offers himself to the Father to expiate the sins of the world by the sacrifice of himself, and not only so, but also to obtain redemption for the dead—in which no invitation is given to partake, but one individual sets himself apart from the whole flock—and where, if any one comes forward to partake, the half is withheld from him?

Anciently, when the people were remiss in their attend-

ance, Chrysostom said, In vain stand we at the altar. He said this at a time when he had been used to many corruptions. What will our Lord say when his ordinance is not only corrupted but altogether subverted? Let them go then, and anew, by their sacrilege, provoke the anger of the Lord, already too much awakened. Next, they exhort all to fast every Friday in remembrance of our Lord's passion, &c. Is this what Paul teaches concerning the observance of days? Is this his admonition regarding the choice of meats, in the same Epistle, where he calls it *εθελοθρησκεια*, *i.e.*, a factitious worship, which, however it may have a show of wisdom, being founded only on the decisions of men, vanishes along with the meats which perish in the using? Where, pray, have they read that the Lord commanded such a commemoration of his death? Nay, rather by his death, everything of the kind was abolished. What then is to be said of those preparatory steps by which they wish to bring the Holy Spirit down from heaven? What, but just that they are fatuous superstitions fit for old women to talk of when sitting with the wool and distaff. To these they add litanies, that is, chants consisting of as many blasphemies as words. With what gloss will they excuse their passing by the intercession of Christ in perfect silence, and choosing hundreds of advocates for themselves at will from among the dead? What resemblance has the doctrine of Scripture, or the primitive customs of the godly, to their conduct in omitting the one Mediator of God and man, fixing by name or mediations which they have assumed at their own hand, and at length invoking the whole body of the saints, as if they were all bound up in one bundle? However they permit themselves to depart from the pure doctrine of the Gospel, it is certain that at a time when superstition had so far prevailed, that holy pastors could not hold the straight course, it was prohibited in distinct terms by the Council of Carthage, to invoke saints at the altar, or the priest was forbidden to use the expression, "St. Peter or St. Paul, pray for us." What reformation is to be hoped from those whose degeneracy so much outstrips even a degenerate eye?

FIRST DECREE PUBLISHED IN THE THIRD SESSION OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1546.

IN the Name of the Holy and undivided Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. This Sacred, Œcumenical, and General Council of Trent, lawfully met in the Holy Spirit, under the presidency of the foresaid three Legates of the Apostolic See, considering the magnitude of the affairs to be handled, especially those which are included under the two heads of Extirpating Heresies and Reforming Manners, for which purposes especially it has met; and acknowledging with the Apostle that it has to wrestle not only with flesh and blood, but with spiritual wickednesses in high places, with the same Apostle, specially exhorts all and each to be strong in the Lord and in the power of his might, in all things taking the shield of faith whereby they may be able to ward off all the fiery darts of the wicked one, and receive the helmet of the hope of salvation, which is the word of God. Wherefore, that this pious solicitude of the Council may have its beginning and progress by the grace of God, it has before all things determined and decreed to prefix a Confession of Faith, herein following the examples of the Fathers, who in more solemn Councils were wont to set up this shield against all heresies at the commencement of their proceedings; by which alone they sometimes drew over infidels to the faith, routed heretics, and confirmed the faithful. That Creed, therefore, which the Holy Roman Church uses as the first principles in which all who profess the Christian faith necessarily agree, and the firm and only foundation against which the gates of hell shall never prevail, the Council has judged it proper to express in the very words in which it is read in the churches, and which is as follows:—

"I believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, of all things visible and invisible: And in our Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, and born of the Father before all ages: God of God, light of light, very God of very God, begotten not made, of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made: Who because of us men and our salvation came down from the heavens, and was incarnate of the Holy Spirit by the Virgin Mary; and became man: He was also crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, suffered and was buried, and rose again on the third day, according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father: And he will come again with glory to judge the quick and the dead; and of his kingdom there will be no end. And I believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, who with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified; who spake by the Prophets. And I believe in one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins, and I wait for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come. Amen."

Moreover, the Holy, Œcumenical, and General Council of Trent, lawfully met in the Holy Spirit, under the presidency of the foresaid three Legates of the Apostolic See, understanding that many prelates from different quarters are prepared for the journey, and some also are on their way, and considering that all the things to be decreed by the Holy Council may seem to be in higher estimation and honour with all, the greater and fuller the Council and attendance of Fathers by which they are sanctioned and confirmed, the Council have determined and decreed that the next Session after the present will be held on the first Thursday following the *Laetare* Sunday next to come. Meanwhile, however, they will take care that the discussion and examination of the matters which may seem proper to be discussed and examined by the Council be not deferred.

On the Decree of the Third Session.

One might think that the venerable Fathers mean something very lofty when they talk of the spiritual armour of St. Paul. But from the swollen mountain nothing but empty smoke comes forth, nothing at least that can be of any use in our present necessity; for they only subscribe the Confession of Faith which is chanted in churches. They had published a decree in the beginning of January; they delay the publication of this second one till February. What need was there of such long deliberation in a clear matter? Was this the result of a month's investigation? They must be very diligent and laborious in difficult matters, if they are so long occupied when they have nothing to do. Therefore, that they might not appear to have spent time to no purpose, when the day arrives,—"the leaders seated and the vulgar thronged around,"—they with loud voice proclaim their belief in points as to which all men knew there was no dispute. They will say that they did so according to form and custom. But did a ceremonial of no difficulty require a whole month? This device, while they sit saying nothing, is certainly too puerile to prove that they have not been idle. But with what gravity do they pronounce? They say we profess to believe the Creed as it is in the Missal. Though I were not to expose their trifling, it is strange that they are not themselves ashamed of it. As to the many prelates whom they supposed on the way to them from various quarters, they were in a mistake. For at last scarcely forty were collected. They therefore lost the high estimation which they expected from their great numbers. And yet, in my opinion, they do themselves injustice when they make fewness of numbers a disparagement. So high is their authority with me, that five hundred men like themselves would not give the least additional weight to it!

FIRST DECREE OF THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

Held 8th April 1546.

The Holy, Œcumenical, and General Council of Trent, lawfully met in the Holy Spirit, under the presidency of the foresaid three Legates of the Apostolic See, keeping it constantly in view that by the removal of error the full purity of the Gospel may be preserved in the Church; which Gospel promised before by the prophets, our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God first promulgated with his own lips, and afterwards ordered to be published by his Apostles to every creature, as the fountain of all saving truth and moral discipline; and perceiving that this truth and discipline is contained in written books, and unwritten traditions which, received from the lips of Christ himself by the Apostles, or as it were handed down by the Apostles themselves under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, have come even to us—following the example of orthodox Fathers, the Council with like pious affection and reverence receives and venerates all the Books both of the Old and New Testaments, seeing that one God is the author of both—and likewise also the traditions pertaining both to faith and manners, as dictated either by the lips of Christ or by the Holy Spirit, and preserved by uninterrupted succession in the Catholic Church. It has been thought proper to subjoin a list of the Sacred Books to this Decree, that no doubt may arise as to what the Books are which the Council receives. They are as follows: Of the Old Testament the Five Books of Moses, *i.e.*, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy; Joshua, Judges, Ruth; four Books of Kings; two of Chronicles; the first Book of Esdras, and the second, which is called Nehemiah; Tobit,

Judith, Hester, Job; the Psalter of David, containing one hundred and fifty Psalms; the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, the Book of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus; Isaiah, Jeremiah, with Baruch, Ezekiel, Daniel; the twelve Minor Prophets, *i.e.*, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zachariah, Malachi; two Books of Maccabees, the First and Second; of the New Testament, the four Gospels according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; the Acts of the Apostles, written by the Evangelist Luke; fourteen Epistles of the Apostle Paul, viz., to the Romans, two to the Corinthians, to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, to the Philippians, to the Colossians, two to the Thessalonians, two to Timothy, to Titus, to Philemon, to the Hebrews; two of the Apostle Peter; three of the Apostle John; one of the Apostle James; one of the Apostle Jude, and the Apocalypse of the Apostle John. Whosoever shall not receive these entire Books, with all their parts, as they are accustomed to be read in the Catholic Church, and are contained in the old Vulgate Latin edition, as sacred and canonical, and shall knowingly and intentionally despise the foresaid traditions, let him be anathema. Wherefore, let all understand the way and order in which the Council, after laying the foundation of a Confession of Faith is to proceed, and what testimonies and supports it will chiefly employ in confirming doctrines and renewing discipline in the Church.

SECOND DECREE OF THE FOURTH SESSION.

Moreover, the foresaid Holy Council considering that it may confer no small benefit on the Church of God, if from among all the Latin editions of the Sacred Books which are in use, it notifies what one is to be held authentic, it statutes and declares that the ancient Vulgate edition, approved by its long use for so many centuries in the Church itself, be held authentic in public lectures, debates, sermons, and expositions; and that no man is to dare or presume on any pretext to reject it.

Besides, in order to curb petulant minds, the Council decrees that no man trusting to his own wisdom, in matters of faith and discipline pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine, twisting the Sacred Scripture to his own sense, dare to interpret the Holy Scripture contrary to that sense which holy mother Church, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, has held and holds, or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers, even though these interpretations are never to be published. Let those who contravene be denounced by the ordinaries, and punished with the pains appointed by law.

Wishing, also, as is proper, to regulate printers in this matter, who now, without regulation, *i.e.*, thinking themselves at liberty to act as they please, without license from their ecclesiastical superiors, print the books of Holy Scripture, and, moreover, annotations and expositions of whatever description, often without mentioning the press, or giving a fictitious one, and (what is worse) without the author's name, and have books of this description printed elsewhere promiscuously for sale; the Council statutes and decrees, that hereafter the Holy Scriptures, and especially the ancient Vulgate edition, be printed as correctly as possible, and that no one be allowed to print, or cause to be printed, any books on sacred subjects without the name of the author, nor in future to sell them, or even have them in his possession, unless they have been first examined and approved by the Ordinary, under pain of anathema, and the penalty mentioned in the canon of the last Lateran Council. If the persons be Regulars, not subject to this mode of examination and approbation, they shall be bound to obtain a license from their superiors, after the books have been recognised by them according to the form of their own ordinances.

Those who lend or circulate these works in manuscript, before they have been examined and approved, shall be liable to the same penalties as the printers; and those who shall have had them, or read them, if they do not give up the author, shall be held to be authors. The approbation of this class of books must be given in writing, and appear authenticated in front of the book, or manuscript, or print. The whole of this

duty, *i.e.*, the examination and approbation, must be done gratuitously, so that what deserves approval may be approved, and disapprobation reprobated.

Moreover, wishing to repress the temerity by which the words of Holy Scripture are turned and twisted to all kinds of profanity—to buffoonery, fable, vanity, adulation, detraction, impious superstitions, diabolical charms, divinations, casting of lots, and also slanderous libels, the Council commands and ordains, in order to put an end to such irreverence and contempt, and prevent any one from daring, in future, in any way to use the words of Scripture for these and similar purposes, that all persons of this description, all corrupters and violators of the Word of God, shall be coerced by their bishops by legal and discretionary punishment.

Likewise the Holy Council has statuted and decreed, that the next session shall be held and celebrated on the fifth day after the most sacred festival of Pentecost ensuing.

On the Fourth Session.

There is an old proverb,—The Romans conquer by sitting. Trusting to this, those degenerate and bastard sons of the Roman See, *i.e.*, the great harlot, sat down to conquer when they appointed the third session. For what hinders them from raising a trophy, and coming off victorious to their hearts' content, if we concede to them what they have comprehended in one decree? There are four heads: First, they ordain that in doctrine we are not to stand on Scripture alone, but also on things handed down by tradition. Secondly, in forming a catalogue of Scripture, they mark all the books with the same chalk, and insist on placing the Apocrypha in the same rank with the others. Thirdly, repudiating all other versions whatsoever, they retain the Vulgate only, and order it to be authentic. Lastly, in all passages either dark

or doubtful, they claim the right of interpretation without challenge. These four things being established, who can deny that the war is ended? Wherefore, their after discussions were more for ostentation than from any necessity for them; for whatever they produce, if supported by no authority of Scripture, will be classed among traditions, which they insist should have the same authority as the Law and the Prophets. What, then, will it be permitted to disapprove? for there is no gross old wife's dream which this pretext will not enable them to defend; nay, there is no superstition, however monstrous, in front of which they may not place it like a shield of Ajax. Add to this, that they provide themselves with new supports when they give full authority to the Apocryphal books. Out of the second of the Maccabees they will prove Purgatory and the worship of saints; out of Tobit satisfactions, exorcisms, and what not. From Ecclesiasticus they will borrow not a little. For from whence could they better draw their dregs? I am not one of those, however, who would entirely disapprove the reading of those books; but in giving them an authority which they never before possessed, what end was sought but just to have the use of spurious paint in colouring their errors? But as the Hebrew or Greek original often serves to expose their ignorance in quoting Scripture, to check their presumption, and so keep down their thrasonic boasting, they ingeniously meet this difficulty also by determining that the Vulgate translation only is to be held authentic. Farewell, then, to those who have spent much time and labour in the study of languages, that they might search for the genuine sense of Scripture at the fountainhead! At least it has been amply provided by this decree that they shall give no farther trouble to the Romanists. Is not this to subdue Greece and all the East? One thing still was wanting; for disagreeable men were always springing up, who, when anything was brought into question, could not be satisfied without Scripture proof! There are others too clear-sighted, since even in the Vulgate translation they find weapons wherewith to annoy the Papacy. That they may not sustain loss from this quarter, they devise a most excellent remedy, when they adjudge to themselves the

legitimate interpretation of Scripture. Who can now imagine any improvidence in them? By one article they have obtained the means of proving what they please out of Scripture, and escaping from every passage that might be urged against them. If Confession is to be proved, they are ready with—"Shew yourselves to the priests." If it be asked, Whether recourse should be had to the intercession of the dead? the passage will immediately occur, "Turn to some one of the saints;" also, "For this every holy man will pray to thee." Nor will Purgatory be left without a sure foundation, for it is written, "He shall not come out thence till he shall have paid the uttermost farthing." In short, anything may be made of anything! When they formerly produced such passages they made themselves ridiculous even to children. Now, if credit is given them, the right of authorized interpretation will remove every doubt. For what passage can be objected to them so clear and strong that they shall not evade it? Any kind of quibble will at once relieve them from difficulty. Against opposing arguments they will set up this brazen wall—Who are you to question the interpretation of the Church? This, no doubt, is what they mean by a saying common among them, in that Scripture is a nose of wax, because it can be formed into all shapes. If postulates of this kind were given to mathematicians, they would not only make an ell an inch, but prove a mile shorter than an ell, till they had thrown everything into confusion.

What, then, are we to do with this victorious and now, as it were, triumphal Session? Just stand and let the smoke clear away. In regard to Traditions, I am aware that not unfrequent mention of them is made by ancient writers, though not with the intention of carrying our faith beyond the Scriptures, to which they always confine it. They only say that certain customs were received from the Apostles. Some of them appear to have that origin, but others are unworthy of it. These touch only upon a few points, and such as might be tolerated. But now we are called to believe, that whatever the Romanists are pleased to obtrude upon us, flowed by tradition from the Apostles; and so shameless are they, that without observing any distinction,

they bring into this class things which crept in not long ago, during the darkness of ignorance. Therefore, though we grant that the Apostles of the Lord handed down to posterity some customs which they never committed to writing; still, *first*, this has nothing to do with the doctrine of faith, (as to it we cannot extract one iota from them,) but only with external rites subservient to decency or discipline; and *secondly*, it is still necessary for them to prove that everything to which they give the name is truly an apostolical tradition. Accordingly they cannot, as they suppose, find anything here to countenance them either in establishing the tyranny of their laws, by which they miserably destroy consciences, or to cloak their superstitions, which are evidently a farrago gathered from the vicious rites of all ages and nations. We especially repudiate their desire to make certainty of doctrine depend not less on what they call *αγραφα*, (unwritten,) than on the Scriptures. We must ever adhere to Augustine's rule, "Faith is conceived from the Scriptures."

Of their admitting all the Books promiscuously into the Canon, I say nothing more than it is done against the consent of the primitive Church. It is well known what Jerome states as the common opinion of earlier times. And Ruffinus, speaking of the matter as not at all controverted, declares with Jerome that Ecclesiasticus, the Wisdom of Solomon, Tobit, Judith, and the history of the Maccabees, were called by the Fathers not canonical but ecclesiastical books, which might indeed be read to the people, but were not entitled to establish doctrine. I am not, however, unaware that the same view on which the Fathers of Trent now insist was held in the Council of Carthage. The same, too, was followed by Augustine in his Treatise on Christian Doctrine; but as he testifies that all of his age did not take the same view, let us assume that the point was then undecided. But if it were to be decided by arguments drawn from the case itself, many things beside the phraseology would shew that those Books which the Fathers of Trent raise so high must sink to a lower place. Not to mention other things, whoever it was that wrote the history of the Maccabees ex-

presses a wish, at the end, that he may have written well and congruously; but if not, he asks pardon. How very alien this acknowledgment from the majesty of the Holy Spirit!

In condemning all translations except the Vulgate, as the error is more gross, so the edict is more barbarous. The sacred oracles of God were delivered by Moses and the Prophets in Hebrew, and by the Apostles in Greek. That no corner of the world might be left destitute of so great a treasure, the gift of interpretation was added. It came to pass—I know not by what means, but certainly neither by judgment nor right selection—that of the different versions, one became the favourite of the unlearned, or those at least who, not possessing any knowledge of languages, desired some kind of help to their ignorance. Those, on the other hand, who are acquainted with the languages perceive that this version teems with innumerable errors; and this they make manifest by the clearest evidence. On the other hand, the Fathers of Trent contend, that although the learned thus draw the pure liquor from the very fountain, and convict the infallible Vulgate of falsehood, they are not to be listened to. No man possessed of common sense ever presumed to deprive the Church of God of the benefit of learning. The ancients, though unacquainted with the languages, especially with Hebrew, always candidly acknowledge that nothing is better than to consult the original, in order to obtain the true and genuine meaning. I will go further. There is no man of ordinary talent who, on comparing the Vulgate version with some others, does not easily see that many things which were improperly rendered by it are in these happily restored. The Council, however, insists that we shall shut our eyes against the light that we may spontaneously go astray.

Who could have imagined they would be so senseless as thus boldly to despise the judgments of good men, and hesitate not to make themselves odious and detestable to all? Those who were aware that they had nothing useful in view, were yet persuaded that they would make some show of it to the world, and assign to some of their sworn ad-

herents the task of executing a new version. In this instance, however, they use no deceit. They not only order us to be contented with a most defective translation, but insist on our worshipping it, just as if it had come down from heaven; and while the blemishes are conspicuous to all, they prohibit us from desiring any improvement. Behold the men on whose judgment the renovation of the Church depends!

It were tedious beyond measure to mark the passages erroneously and absurdly rendered. So far is there from being an entire page, that there are scarcely three continuous verses without some noted blunder. As a specimen, let the Book of Psalms suffice, in which I will touch on a few examples in passing, more to give my readers a sample which may dispose them to ascertain for themselves, than to give full information. In the second Psalm is the well-known exhortation, "Kiss the Son." For this the Vulgate has, "Lay hold of discipline!" There is no resemblance. While the former is clearly correct, why should the latter be held the more authentic? The Vulgate interpreter has, "Sons of man, how long will you with a heavy heart?" while the Hebrew has nothing like this, but, "How long will ye turn my glory into shame?" (Ps. iv. 3.) Where David complains that his sap was turned into the drought of summer, (Ps. xxxii. 4,) the translator has substituted, "I am turned in my sorrow till the thorn is fixed." Again, in another verse, "In their mouths is bit and bridle to prevent them from approaching thee;" but the translator says, "With hook and rein curb the jaws of those who do not draw near unto thee." And what are we to understand by "lungs filled with illusions," in Ps. xxxviii.?

But I act imprudently in entering a boundless forest; I will therefore confine myself to a single Psalm. It will be the sixty-eighth. There David, among the other praises of God, mentions this also, that he makes the single to dwell in a house, *i.e.*, enriches the solitary and childless with a family. The translator substitutes, that he makes them "of one manner." The next words are, "He places the rebellious in a dry parched place." For this the translator has,

"In like manner those who exasperate; who dwell in the tombs." Afterward, where the meaning is perfectly obvious in the words of David, the translator makes a riddle fit to puzzle an Œdipus. David says, "The kings of armies have fled, have fled, and the dwellers of the house, *i.e.*, the women who remained at home, have divided the spoil." The translator says, "The king, the virtue of the beloved, beloved, and houses of appearance, have divided the spoil." A little further on, "Though ye have slept among the pots;" translator, "among the clergy!" "To look up to the piled mountains" he substitutes for, "To envy the fertile mountains." Where the Hebrew original has, "Even the rebellious, that God the Lord may dwell," the translator has, "Even those not believing that God the Lord dwells." Again, when the literal meaning is, "I will bring back from Bashan, I will bring back from the depths of the sea," the translator gives the very opposite, "I will turn from Bashan, I will turn into the depth of the sea." Again, "There is little Benjamin their ruler." The translator (I know not what he was thinking of) says, "In excess of mind." I have gone over the half of the Psalm or rather more. What monstrosities do my readers already perceive!

And yet, to confess the truth, there is an excuse for the Latin translator, who gave the meaning of the Greek version as exactly as he could. But who can tolerate those blunderers, who would rob the Church of the gift of interpretation, and thus, as it were, close up the entrance, that none might have access to the pure meaning of David? Add, that they not only prefer the ignorance and blunders of their interpreters to the true renderings of others, but there is no hallucination, however gross, to which they will not give the power of a divine oracle. There is an example of this in Psalm cxxxii. The Lord there promises that he will bless the food of his people. Some luscious priestling, reading the *c* and *t* as one letter, makes the word *vidum;* but as there is no such word, the insertion of a letter introduced a new reading, which prevails throughout the Papacy, and hence there is no church in Italy, France, Spain, and Germany, in which they do not with loud voice bawl out,

"His widow blessing, I will bless." And so attentive and clear-sighted are they, that none of them has observed the ridiculous corruption. But it is not strange that, when they rob us of the word for bread, they introduce the mention of widowhood, since the object on which they are wholly bent is cruelly to bereave souls of the bread of heavenly life. What! are they not ashamed to make the Vulgate version of the New Testament authoritative, while the writings of Valla, Faber, and Erasmus, which are in everybody's hands, demonstrate with the finger, even to children, that it is vitiated in innumerable places? In the first chapter of the Romans the translator calls Christ "the predestinated Son of God." Those not acquainted with Greek are at a loss to explain this term, because, properly speaking, only things which do not yet exist are predestinated; whereas Christ is the eternal Son of God. There is no difficulty in the Greek word, which means "*declared.*" I have given one example. It were needless labour to give others. In one word, were this edict of the Council sanctioned, the simple effect would be, that the Fathers of Trent would make the world look with their eyes open, and yet not see the light presented to them.

I come to the right of interpreting, which they arrogate to themselves whenever the meaning is doubtful. It is theirs, they say, to give the meaning of Scripture, and we must acquiesce. For everything which they bestow upon the Church they bestow upon themselves. I acknowledge, indeed, that as Scripture came not by the private will of man, (2 Pet. i. 21,) it is unbecoming to wrest it to the private sense of any man. Nay, in the case of an obscure passage, when it is doubtful what sense ought to be adopted, there is no better way of arriving at the true meaning than for pious doctors to make common inquiry, by engaging in religious discussion. But that is not now the question. They wish, by their tyrannical edict, to deprive the Church of all liberty, and arrogate to themselves a boundless license; for, be the meaning which they affix to Scripture what it may, it must be immediately embraced. Except themselves, moreover, no man will be permitted to prove anything out of

Scripture. Would that they were equal to the performance of so great a task. But oxen usurp the reins, or rather asses the lyre. In short, their aim is to make all revere a Scripture hidden in darkness like the mysteries of Ceres, and let none presume to aspire to the understanding of it.

There would be no end were I to collect all the examples which would make it plain to my readers what fetters of iniquitous and intolerable slavery are forged by this decree. I will therefore give a specimen, in the case of only one Council. About the year 800 was held a Council of Nice, which both restored Images that had been overthrown under Leo and decreed that they were to be worshipped. That Council, because it supports idolatry, the Papists deem holy and lawful. Hence, according to their axiom, it cannot have erred in the exposition of Scripture. But if such interpreters of sacred things are to be listened to, (it is abominable to say they are,) the religion of the Egyptians will be preferable to the Christian. To prove from Scripture that churches were properly adorned with images and pictures, the following passages were adduced:—"God created man after his own image and likeness;" "Joshua erected twelve stones;" "No man lighteth a candle and putteth it under a bushel;" whence they inferred that images were to be placed upon altars! Again, "The light of thy countenance has been stamped upon us:" "as we have heard, so have we also seen;" "O Lord, I have loved the beauty of thy house;" "Shew me thy face, for it is lovely." In support of adoration, they wrested the following passages:—"Abraham worshipped the people of the land;" "Jacob set up an inscription, and blessed." Again, "He worshipped the top of the staff of his son Joseph;" "All the rich among the people will deprecate thy countenance;" "Worship his footstool;" "God is to be admired in his saints." And that nothing might be wanting to crown their effrontery, they appended out of another psalm, "His saints who are on the earth." This they applied to images!

I am aware that the narrative I now give will scarcely seem credible. I was myself amazed when I read it, though our ears should long ago have been trained by them to any

absurdities, however enormous. Were I to collect all their interpretations, which even children would laugh at, and not even all, but those which are distinguished by some notable absurdity, I would require to form a volume thrice as large as the Bible.

The sum is, that the spirit of Trent wished, by this decree, that Scripture should only signify to us whatever dreaming monks might choose. For what else do they mean by the Church? Though the Roman bishops, I mean all who serve under the banner and auspices of that Anti-Christian See, were to assemble from every quarter of the world, how, pray, could they, by laying their heads together, frame a proper version for us? Many of them hardly knew the elements of grammar. At least, they will not venture to deny that there is scarcely one in a hundred who has read an entire book of the Prophets, or one of the Apostolical Epistles, or one of the Gospels. They are too much occupied with other cares to have any leisure for sacred literature. The only resource is, to reserve the privilege for the Apostolic See, and say that the interpretation of Scripture must be sought from the holy lips of Paul Farnese! Otherwise, let them shew us a Church which may justly be deemed able to sustain so great a burden. For, how highly soever they may extol the Roman See, they can never persuade some men either that Cephas is its head, or that chaste and holy marriage is the carnal life which is accursed in the sight of God. Both of these have been asserted in Papal responses. They cry out that the whole authority of the Church must fall if it is denied the right of interpreting Scripture—that a door would thus be thrown open to lascivious minds, allowing them to break through every restraint. Nay, in order to cast obloquy upon us, they are wont to charge us with arrogating the interpretation of Scripture to ourselves, in order that there may be no check on our licentiousness. Modesty will not allow me to speak of ourselves as fact would justify; and yet I will most truly declare that we have thrown more light upon the Scriptures than all the doctors who have appeared under the Papacy since its commencement. This praise even they themselves dare not deny us. Still there is none of us who does not

willingly submit his lucubrations to the judgment of the Church. Therefore we neither contemn nor impair the authority of the Church ; nor do we give loose reins to men to dare what they please. I wish they would shew us such a Church as Scripture itself pourtrays ; we should easily agree as to the respect due to it. But when, falsely assuming the name of Church, they seize upon the spoils of which they have robbed it, what else can we do than protest ?

FIRST DECREE OF THE FIFTH SESSION OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT,

Held June 17, 1546.

That our Catholic Faith, without which it is impossible to please God, may remain in its purity, entire, and untainted, errors being purged away, and that the Christian people may not be carried about by every wind of doctrine, seeing that that old Serpent, the perpetual enemy of the human race, among the very numerous evils with which the Church of God is disturbed in these our days, has stirred up not only new, but also old disputes on the subject of Original Sin, and its remedy; the Holy, Œcumenical, and General Council of Trent, lawfully met in the Holy Spirit, under the presidency of the foresaid Legates of the Apostolic See, desirous to come forward to recall the erring and confirm the wavering, in accordance with the testimony of the Sacred Scriptures, and holy Fathers, and most approved Councils, and the judgment and consent of the Church herself acknowledges, statutes, and declares on the subject of Original Sin, as follows:—

Whosoever confesses not that Adam, the first man, when he had transgressed the command of God in Paradise, instantly lost the holiness and righteousness in which he had been created, and by the guilt of his transgression incurred the wrath and indignation of God, and thereby the death with which God had previously threatened him; and with death captivity under the power of him who thereafter had the empire of death, that is, the devil; and that the whole Adam, by the guilt of that transgression, was changed to the worse in body and soul, let him be anathema.

Whosoever asserts that the transgression of Adam hurt himself only, and not his posterity, and also that he lost for himself alone, and not for us, the holiness and righteousness

which he had received from God, or that he, when corrupted, transfused into all the human race by the sin of his disobedience only death and corporal pains, but not sin, which is the death of the soul, let him be anathema, seeing he contradicts the Apostle, who declares, that "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, inasmuch as all have sinned."

Whosoever asserts that this sin of Adam, which is one by origin, and which transfused by propagation, not by imitation, is proper to each individual, is taken away either by the power of human nature or by some other remedy than the merit of one Mediator, our Lord Jesus Christ, who reconciled God to us in his own blood, being made unto us righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption; or denies that this merit of Christ Jesus is applied to infants as well as adults by the Sacrament of Baptism duly conferred after the form of the Church, let him be anathema: seeing "there is no other name given under heaven among men, whereby we may be saved." Hence the words, "Behold the Lamb of God; behold him who taketh away the sins of the world;" and "Whosoever of you are baptized, have put on Christ."

Whosoever affirms that new-born infants are not to be baptized, even though they are the children of baptized parents, or says that they are indeed baptized for the remission of sins, but derive no original sin from Adam, which requires to be expiated by the laver of regeneration in order to obtain eternal life—whence it follows, that in them the form of baptism for the remission of sins is not true but false, let him be anathema; seeing that the words of the Apostle, "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, inasmuch as all have sinned," cannot be understood in any other sense than that in which the Church everywhere diffused has always understood them. By reason of this rule of faith, according to the tradition of the Apostles, even infants who of themselves could not have committed sin, are truly baptized for the remission of sins, in order that what they have contracted by generation may be cleansed by regeneration. For "unless

a man be born of water and of the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God."

Whosoever denies that the guilt of original sin is remitted by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is conferred in baptism, or even asserts that that which has the true and proper nature of sin is not wholly taken away, but is only rased or not imputed, let him be anathema. For in the regenerate is nothing which God hates, because there is no condemnation in them who have been truly buried with Christ by baptism unto death, who walk not after the flesh; but putting off the old man, and putting on the new man, who is created after God, have been made innocent, unspotted, pure, harmless, and beloved of God, heirs indeed of God and co-heirs with Christ, so that there is nothing to hinder their entrance into heaven. But that concupiscence, or the motions of sin, remain in the baptized, this Holy Council acknowledges and feels; which, as it is left for trial, is not able to hurt those not consenting to it, and manfully withstanding it through the grace of Christ: Nay, he who strives lawfully will be crowned: This concupiscence, which the Apostle sometimes calls sin, the Holy Council declares that the Catholic Church never understood to be called sin, because it is not truly and properly sin in the regenerate, but because it is of sin and inclines to sin. Whoever holds the contrary of this, let him be anathema.

This Holy Council, however, declares that it is not their intention to comprehend in this decree, where it treats of original sin, the blessed and immaculate Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, but that the constitutions of Pope Sixtus IV., of happy memory, are to be observed, under the penalties contained in these constitutions, which the Council renews.

SECOND DECREE OF THE FIFTH SESSION.

The Holy Council, adhering to the pious constitutions of supreme Pontiffs and approved Councils, and embracing them, and adding to them, in order that the heavenly treasure of

the Sacred Books which the Holy Spirit hath, with the greatest liberality delivered to men, may not lie neglected, has statuted and decreed, that in their Churches in which prebends or prestimony, or other stipend, by whatever name called, is found to have been assigned for lecturers on sacred Theology, the Bishops, Archbishops, Primates, and other Ordinaries of the places, shall force and compel those who hold the prebend, prestimony, or stipend, of this description, to expound and interpret the Holy Scripture personally, if they are fit; if otherwise, by a fit substitute to be chosen by the Bishops, Archbishops, Primates, and other Ordinaries of the places, and this under the penalty of sequestering the fruits. In future, let prebends, prestimony, and stipend of this description, be conferred on none but such as are fit and can perform the office in person, and let any appointment made otherwise be null and void.

In Metropolitan or Cathedral Churches, if the city is distinguished or populous, and also in Colleges existing in any important town, though belonging to the diocese, if the clergy there be numerous, where no prebend, prestimony, or stipend of this kind is found to have been assigned, let the first vacant stipend, from whatever cause arising, (resignation excepted,) be understood to be *ipso facto* constituted and assigned in perpetuity to that use. And whenever in the churches themselves there is no prebend, or one that is insufficient, let the Metropolitan, or the Bishop, by the assignation of the fruits of some simple benefice, (subject, however, to the due burdens of the same,) or by the contributions of the beneficiaries of his city or diocese, or otherwise as may be more convenient, provide, with the advice of the Chapter, for the delivery of lectures on the Holy Scriptures, providing always that other lectures, appointed either by custom or in any other way, may not on that account be at all omitted.

Let Churches, when the annual incomes are slender, and the number of clergy and people so small that a lectureship on Theology cannot be conveniently established, at least have a master to be chosen by the Bishop, with the advice of the Chapter, to teach grammar gratis to the clergy and other poor scholars, that, with the will of God, they may pass

thereafter to the study of the Holy Scriptures. To that grammar master, therefore, let there be assigned either the fruits of some simple benefice to be drawn by him while he continues to teach, provided always, that the benefice itself be not defrauded of its due service; or let some fit salary be paid from the table of the Chapter or Bishop; or otherwise let the bishop himself adopt some plan suited to his church and diocese, so that this pious, useful, and salutary provision may not on any pretext whatever be neglected.

Also in the Monasteries of Monks, when it can be conveniently, let a Scripture lectureship be established: if in this matter the abbots are neglectful, let the bishops of the diocese see to it that delegates of the Apostolic See may take fit means to compel them.

In the Convents of other Regulars in which literary pursuits may conveniently flourish, let a Scripture lecture be in like manner established, and let this lecture be assigned by the general or provincial chapters to the better qualified masters.

In the Public Schools, where this honourable and of all others most necessary lectureship has not hitherto been appointed, let it be appointed by the piety of most religious princes and states, for the defence and increase of the Catholic faith, and the preservation and propagation of sound doctrine. Where it was appointed, but has fallen into neglect, let it be restored.

And lest impiety be disseminated under the show of piety, the Holy Council enacts that no person shall enter upon this office of lecturing, unless previously tried and approved by the bishop of the place, in respect of life, manners, and knowledge. This, however, is not to be understood of lecturers in the cloisters of monks.

Moreover, let those teaching the Sacred Scriptures, while they teach publicly in schools, and the scholars who study in these schools, fully possess and enjoy in absence all the privileges conferred by the common law in regard to the drawing of fruits, prebends, and benefices.

But as the preaching of the Gospel is not less necessary to the Christian commonwealth than lecturing, and is the

special office of bishops, the Holy Council has statuted and decreed, that all Bishops, Archbishops, Primates, and other prelates of churches, shall be bound personally, if under no lawful impediment, to preach the holy Gospel of Jesus Christ.

But if it shall happen that the Bishops and others aforesaid are prevented by a lawful impediment, in accordance with the form of the General Council, they shall be bound to assume fit persons duly to execute this office of preaching. If any one contumaciously refuses to obey, let him be subjected to rigorous punishment.

Let Archpresbyters also, Curates, Parsons parochial, or otherwise holding a cure of souls, by whatever tenure they hold their churches, personally, or if under lawful impediment, by fit persons, at least on the Lord's day, and on solemn feast days, feed the people committed to them, according to their ability, with saving words, by teaching them those things which all must know in order to salvation, and announcing to them with brevity and plainness of speech the vices to be shunned and the virtues to be followed, in order to escape eternal punishment and gain celestial glory. Should any one neglect to perform this duty, though he should claim on some ground or other to be exempted from the jurisdiction of the bishop, or although the churches should be said to be in some way exempted or perhaps annexed and united to some monastery, even situated out of the diocese, still, provided they are locally within the diocese, let the careful pastoral superintendence of the bishops not be wanting, lest the saying should be fulfilled, "The little ones asked for bread, and there was none to break it to them." Wherefore, if after being admonished by the bishop, they continue for three months to fail in their duty, let them be compelled by ecclesiastical censures, or otherwise, at the discretion of the bishop, so that if he shall so deem it expedient some decent salary may be paid out of the fruits of the benefice to another to perform the duty until the principal be brought to repentance and discharge his own office.

Should any Parochial Churches be found subject to monasteries which are not within any diocese, if the abbots and

regular prelates shall be negligent in the things aforesaid, let them be compelled by the Metropolitans in whose provinces the dioceses are situated, as *quoad hoc* delegates of the Apostolic See. And let no custom, or exemption, or appeal, or reclamation, or action of recovery, have the effect of staying the execution of this decree, until the matter may have been cognosced and decided by a competent judge, who may proceed summarily on a simple examination of the facts.

But let not the Regulars of any order whatsoever, until they have been examined and approved by their superiors in respect of life, manners, and knowledge, and have obtained a license from them, preach even in the churches of their own orders. With this license they must appear personally before the bishops, and ask their benediction before they begin to preach. But in churches not belonging to their orders, they must, in addition to the license of their superiors, have also the license of the bishop, without which they are on no account to preach in churches not belonging to their orders. The bishops must give this license gratis.

Should any Preacher (which God forbid) disseminate errors or scandals among the people, although he preach in a monastery of his own or another order, let the bishop interdict him from preaching; and if he have preached heresy, proceed against him in due course of law, or according to the custom of the place, although the preacher should pretend to be exempted by general or special privilege, in which case let the bishop proceed by apostolic authority as a delegate of the Apostolic See. But let bishops take care that no preacher be slanderously attacked by false information, or otherwise, or have any just ground of complaint.

Let bishops, moreover, beware of allowing any either of those who, though nominally Regulars, live out of the cloister, and without being subject to its rules, or of secular presbyters, unless personally known to them, and of approved learning and character, even under the pretext of any privileges whatsoever, to preach in their city or diocese until the bishops have consulted on the subject with the holy Apostolic See, from which it is not likely that unworthy persons

have extorted such privileges unless by concealment of the truth, or direct falsehood.

Eleemosynary Quaestors, commonly called Questuarii, of whatever condition they may be, must not on any account presume to preach, either in person or by the employment of others. Those doing so are by all means to be restrained by proper methods by the bishops and ordinaries of the places, any privileges to the contrary notwithstanding.

This Holy Council statutes and decrees that the next Session shall be held and celebrated on the Thursday after the feast of St. James the Apostle.

On the First Decree of the Fifth Session.

That there may be somewhat in this Decree in accordance with the Preface, they borrow the first four heads from the ancient and approved doctrine of the Church. As to these there will be no dispute, and therefore it was obviously malicious in them to premise that their object was to settle the dissensions which have arisen at this time. Of what use was it, pray, to thunder out so many anathemas? Just to make the unskilful believe that there really was some ground for it; though, in fact, there was not. In the fifth head, where they introduce something of their own, they begin to act in their own way, that is, to inculcate the futilities of their sophists, and pertinaciously defend them. They pronounce anathema on any one who denies that everything which has the proper nature of sin is taken away by baptism, and who holds that it is only erased or not imputed. Here they craftily introduce the term *erase*, which they know to be in bad odour, as the Pelagians annoyed Augustine with it. Let them, therefore, have it their own way, as far as erasing goes. We assert that the whole guilt of sin is taken away in baptism, so that the remains of sin still existing are not

imputed. That this may be more clear, let my readers call to mind that there is a twofold grace in baptism, for therein both remission of sins and regeneration are offered to us. We teach that full remission is made, but that regeneration is only begun and goes on making progress during the whole of life. Accordingly, sin truly remains in us, and is not instantly in one day extinguished by baptism, but as the guilt is effaced it is null in regard to imputation.

Nothing is plainer than this doctrine. Let us see then why it is anathematised by the Council. There is nothing in the regenerate which God hates; so say the venerable Fathers. Were I to grant them this, does it follow that there is nothing deserving of hatred—or is it not rather true that he hates nothing because he pardons what he might justly hate? The passage from the Apostle which they lay hold of plainly supports our view—"There is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus." By these words he does not exempt believers from blame, as if they were pure and free from all sin. He only frees them from guilt, so that while groaning under the burden of sin they are supported by the consolation which he had formerly mentioned, and of which he afterwards discourses more at large, as we shall shortly see. They add, moreover, that there is nothing to stand in the way of their entering heaven. I admit this, not indeed because there is no impediment, but because nothing can hurt those who are clothed with the innocence of Christ. These horned fathers assign a very different reason, viz., because putting off the old man and putting on the new man, who is created after God, they are pure and harmless. Who would not say that they are quibbling? Surely those who are still in the act have not reached the effect. There is therefore a palpable inconsistency in calling those pure and harmless who are still in course of putting off the old man. If they reply, that though they used the present tense they were speaking of the past, I will give them up. For Paul is addressing believers when he bids the Ephesians put off the old man, thereby intimating that the change by which we are renewed from the flesh into the spirit is not the work of one day merely. What have sound readers yet

observed in the words quoted by the men of Trent which aids them in the least; nay, where is the quotation that is not utterly opposed to them?

Let us proceed, however, in sifting their decree. They affirm that concupiscence, or the tendency to sin, which they acknowledge to remain in the regenerate, cannot hurt those who do not consent to it, seeing it is left for trial. In other words, it does not hurt, because God perfects his strength in their weakness. But if they insist on its being only a whetstone to sharpen their virtue, Paul erroneously complains that on this very account he was wretched.

But I am foolish in arguing against them from use of the term *wretched*, while the names of concupiscence, vice, and sin cannot move them. When it is said that pravity in the will is not sin, it might as well be said that man is not an animal; or when it is said that vice is free from blame before God, it might as well be said that the sun is not a shining body. What shall I say of the term *sin?* They quibble and say that Paul here used the term for the cause and punishment of sin: as if this were not clearly at variance with the context. After mentioning sin he immediately adds, "I find a law, that when I would do good evil is present with me." Do they think that this is also spoken improperly? If it were only a verbal question, still they ought no more to be listened to than those who affirm that infants cannot properly be said to be born with sin. Both interpret sin in the same way. There is this difference, that the latter speak thus of original sin generally, whereas these venerable Fathers maintain that after baptism a thing is no longer the same thing it was, though it remains the same. If they would better their case, they must first of all shew that there is such a conversion in the nature of things that what is the same becomes unlike itself. But the slightest consideration of the matter removes all dispute. It cannot be denied without effrontery, that repugnance to the law of God is truly sin. But the Apostle affirms this of a disease remaining in the regenerate. It follows, therefore, that of its own nature it is sin, although it is not imputed, and the guilt is abolished by the grace of Christ. If the true standard of

righteousness is to love God with the whole heart, and mind, and strength, it is clear that the heart cannot incline otherwise without declining from righteousness. Paul complains that he is hindered from doing the good which he would do. The law, I say, requires perfect love: we do not yield it. Our duty was to run, and we go on slowly limping. In this defect the venerable fathers find nothing which ought to be considered sin.

With the same dishonesty they declare that the Church never understood otherwise. But Ambrose, as Augustine testifies, distinctly calls it "unrighteousness." What says Augustine himself? There are many passages in which his acknowledgment of this appears without obscurity. As when he says, in the second book against Julian, that "in baptism the law of sin is remitted, not ended." Again, "The guilt is loosed, the thing remains." Again, "Sin is dead in the guilt by which it held us, but the dead rebels until cured by the finished work of sepulture." Again, in the homily on John, on the first of Lent, "As long as you live sin must be in your members. At Lent let it be deprived of dominion: do not as it bids." But of many passages it will be sufficient to adduce one which seems to have been written for the express purpose of refuting their folly. In the fifth book against Julian he names three reasons why it is called sin, even in the regenerate. The words are, "As blindness of heart is the sin by which we believe not in God, and the punishment of sin by which the proud heart receives condign chastisement, and the cause of sin when through the error of a blind heart any offence is committed, so the concupiscence of the flesh, which the Good Spirit resists, is also sin, because there is disobedience in it against the dominion of the mind, and the punishment of sin because inflicted on the demerits of the disobedient, and the cause of sin from defect of will or corruption of nature." A meaning, which the Council declares to have been unknown to the early Church, every one here sees set down as the primary meaning by the most competent witness of antiquity. The definition of the Council will be mighty indeed if it can make darkness out of this clear light, and so fascinate the

eyes of men as to make them think they are looking at one thing when they see another.

On the Second Decree of the Fifth Session.

I should like first to know what approved Councils there are which they join with Sovereign Pontiffs? For at the time when lawful Councils of good fame were held no man was acknowledged as sovereign pontiff, nor even as first bishop; for this was expressly forbidden in the Council of Carthage. Accordingly we see that the Councils to which this specious colouring is given, are no other than six or seven spurious Councils held after the light of sound doctrine was extinguished, and discipline had decayed, and when the merest dolts were present—Councils which exhibit no appearance of ancient dignity, but smack of the Gothic tyranny of the Roman See. Fine Reformers, truly! See how things which the Lateran Council raked together from the foul dregs of a most corrupt age, and which posterior Councils made even worse, are here brought forward to claim new honours! But I mistake, for they distinctly avow that they will make I know not what additions to them. To know the quality of these additions we must look at the decrees.

They enjoin, that those who hold prebends intended for lecturers on sacred theology shall perform the office of teaching either themselves or by others if they are unfit. The Council thus leaves men who are unlearned and utterly unfit in possession of the place which they have usurped by fraud, injustice, and sacrilege, without any appearance of law, provided they bestow some small portion of the stipend on substitutes. But they carefully provide that in future none but fit persons shall be admitted! By whose judgment? To whom could they assign the task but to the canonical authorities of the districts? A bishop therefore is to elect any kind of reader he pleases. What Chapter will be so harsh as not to be satisfied with any person, whatever his qualifications? But if he happens to be disapproved, litiga-

tion will arise. Unless something miraculous occur the nomination of the bishop will be sustained. Then what is to be the course of lectures? what the time? what the auditory? As to all these things the venerable fathers are prudently silent, in order to persuade the simple they were doing something when they were doing nothing. What! is not the thing which they prescribe already common? The lecturer, in order merely to preserve the emolument, every week invites two or three of his boon companions, and makes a mere show of lecturing.

In the second chapter they appoint new lectures. Where? In Metropolitan or Episcopal Churches, but only if the city be of note and populous. No doubt they were afraid lest the audience should freeze if the places were less distinguished. This, however, is just as much as saying nothing; but they wish the same rule to be observed in distinguished towns. They say this, but what plan do they propose? That either the bishop assign a stipend out of a simple benefice, or the clergy of the diocese contribute, or some other plan be adopted by the canons. These alternatives can have no other effect than to put the thing off for ages.

To the same effect is their enactment about teachers; for there is no ground to hope that the incomes of priests will be employed in that way; far less that the bishops will curtail their table in the least. The third plan remaining is for the bishop to devise some method. But before the litigation between him and the clergy on the subject of contribution is ended, the memory of the Council of Trent will be buried in oblivion. The worthy decretists are not ignorant of this; but it was necessary to adopt some fiction, so as not to leave it perfectly apparent that nothing was done.

If the fourth chapter be read cursorily, it might cause no little alarm to the monks, lest they should be sent back to theological studies. But there are two exceptions which rid them of their fear. First, they ordain lectures only when it will be convenient. But there is no monastery which is not as inhospitable to all kinds of liberal study as if it were a den of Cyclops. The second exception makes them still safer. Command is given to the bishops to use compulsion

with the abbots if they are negligent. And they are to do this as if they were delegates of the Apostolic See. Therefore, whenever any bishop proves troublesome to an abbot, an appeal will be taken, and the cause will be pleaded at Rome. What will the issue be? The monks will sooner swallow the whole volume of Scripture than be forced to hear one lecture!

Moreover, that no celebrated School may be without a theological lecture, they exhort sovereigns and states to contribute the expense; as if this perfunctory recommendation were to have much weight, especially when it is clear enough that an hundred times more is swallowed up by lazy-bellies than would serve the purpose. Why, then, do they not command it to be taken from that quarter, but just because their real intention is that nothing shall be done?

As the rest are of the same description, there is no use in wasting good time in the discussion of such trifling. It is quite certain that they wished by a profusion of words to blind the eyes of the simple, and make them believe that they were something to the purpose, until experience should teach them how they had been deluded. Every one who has an ounce of sound judgment will acknowledge with me, that the whole is nothing better than a mere sound of words, which they who use them have no wish to be heard.

SIXTH SESSION OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

As at this time, not without the loss of souls and grievous detriment to ecclesiastical unity, certain erroneous views have been disseminated concerning THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION, the Holy, Œcumenical, and General Council of Trent, lawfully met in the Holy Spirit, with the most reverend Lords, John Maria del Monte, bishop of Prænestе, and Marcellus, with the title of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem, Presbyters, Cardinals of the Roman Church, and Apostolic Legates *de latere*, presiding in the name of the most Holy Father in Christ, our Lord Paul III., Pope, by Divine Providence, purposes, with a view to the praise and glory of Almighty God, the tranquillity of the Church, and the salvation of souls, to expound to all the faithful of Christ the true and sound Doctrine of Justification, which Christ the Sun of righteousness, the author and finisher of our faith taught, the Apostles delivered, and the Catholic Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, hath constantly retained; strictly prohibiting any one from daring henceforth to believe, preach, or teach, otherwise than is statuted and declared by the present Decree.

OF THE INCAPABILITY OF NATURE AND THE LAW TO JUSTIFY MEN.

II. The Holy Council declares that to understand the doctrine of Justification properly and purely, it is necessary for every one to acknowledge and confess, that when all had lost their innocence by the transgression of Adam, had become impure, and as the Apostle says, by nature children of wrath, as has been explained in the decree concerning Original Sin, they were so much the servants of sin and under the power of the devil and of death, that not only the Gentiles by the

power of nature, but even the Jews by the very letter of the law of Moses, could not be freed therefrom, or rise, notwithstanding that free-will was by no means extinguished in them, though weakened in its powers and under a bias.

OF THE DISPENSATION AND MINISTRY OF THE ADVENT OF CHRIST.

III. To which it was owing, that our Heavenly Father, the Father of mercies, and God of all consolation, when that blessed fulness of the times was come, sent to men Christ Jesus his Son, both before the Law and in the time of the Law, declared and promised to many holy fathers, to redeem the Jews who were under the Law, and that the Gentiles who did not follow righteousness, might obtain righteousness, and all receive the adoption of sons. Him God set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood for our sins, and not only for ours, but also for the sins of the whole world.

WHO ARE JUSTIFIED BY CHRIST.

IV. But though He died for all, all do not receive the benefit of his death, but those only to whom the merit of his passion is communicated. For as in truth men, if they were not born by propagation from the seed of Adam, would not be born unrighteous, while by that propagation, from the mere fact of their conception, they contract a proper unrighteousness; so, unless they were born again in Christ, they would never be justified, seeing that new birth is given them through the merit of his passion, by the grace by which they are made righteous. For this benefit the Apostle exhorts us always to give thanks to the Father who hath made us meet to partake of the inheritance of the saints in light, and hath rescued us from the power of darkness, and transferred us into the kingdom of the Son of his love, in whom we have redemption and the forgiveness of sins.

IMPLIED DESCRIPTION OF THE JUSTIFICATION OF THE UNGODLY, AND THE METHOD OF IT IN A STATE OF GRACE.

V. In these words there is an implied description of the Justification of the ungodly, viz., that it is a translation from that state in which man, the son of the first Adam, is born to a state of grace, and the adoption of sons by the second Adam, Jesus Christ our Saviour; which translation, since the Gospel was promulgated, cannot be effected without the law of regeneration, or the wish for it; as it is written, "Unless a man be born again," &c.

OF THE NECESSITY OF PREPARATION IN ADULTS FOR JUSTIFICATION, AND WHENCE IT IS.

VI. The Council declares that the commencement of this Justification in adults is to be derived from the preventing grace of God through Jesus Christ; that is, from his calling, by which they are called without any existing merits of their own, so that those who, by sins, were alienated from God, are, by his exciting and assisting grace, disposed to turn in order to their own justification, by assenting freely to the same grace, and co-operating with it. Thus, while God touches the heart of man by the illumination of his Spirit, man himself does nothing at all in receiving that inspiration, for he can reject it; and yet he cannot of his own free will, without the grace of God, make a movement towards justification before him. Hence, in the Sacred Scriptures, when it is said, "Turn ye unto me, and I will turn unto you," we are reminded of our freedom; and when we reply, "Turn thou us, O Lord, and we shall be turned," we acknowledge that we are prevented by the grace of God.

THE MODE OF JUSTIFICATION.

VII. Men are disposed to righteousness when awakened and aided by divine grace, and conceiving faith from hearing, they are freely moved towards God, believing those things to be true which have been divinely revealed and

promised, and specially this, that the wicked is justified of God by his grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus; and while perceiving that they are sinners, turning from the fear of the divine justice, by which they are beneficially alarmed to consider the mercy of God, they are raised to hope, trusting that God will be propitious to them through Christ, and they begin to love him as the source of all righteousness; and they are thus moved against sin by some hatred and detestation, that is, by that penitence which ought to be performed before baptism; in short, while they purpose to receive baptism, to begin a new life, and observe the divine commandments. Of this disposition it is written, "He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is the rewarder of those who seek him;" and, "Be of good courage, son, thy sins are forgiven thee;" and, "The fear of the Lord expels sin;" "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, and ye shall receive the forgiveness of your sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit;" "Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you;" finally, "Prepare your hearts for the Lord," &c.

WHAT IS THE JUSTIFICATION OF THE UNGODLY MAN, AND WHAT ARE ITS CAUSES.

VIII. This preparation or disposition is followed by Justification, which is not the mere forgiveness of sins, but also Sanctification, and the renewal of the inner man, by the voluntary reception of grace and gifts; whence the man from unrighteous becomes righteous, from an enemy becomes a friend, so as to be heir according to the hope of eternal life. The causes of Justification are these:—The final cause is the glory of God and Christ, and eternal life: the efficient cause is a merciful God, who freely washes and sanctifies, sealing and anointing with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is a pledge of our inheritance: The meritorious cause is his beloved, only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus

Christ, who, when we were enemies, because of the great love wherewith he loved us, by his own most holy passion on the wood of the cross, merited justification, and gave satisfaction to the Father for us: The instrumental cause is the sacrament of baptism, which is the sacrament of faith, without which justification is never obtained: In fine, the only formal cause is the righteousness of God, not that by which he himself is righteous, but that by which he makes us righteous, *i.e.*, by which he presents us with it, we are renewed in the spirit of our mind, and are not only reputed, but are truly called and are righteous, each one of us receiving his righteousness in ourselves according to the measure which the Holy Spirit imparts to each as he pleases, and according to the proper disposition and co-operation of each. For although no man can be righteous unless the merits of Christ's passion are communicated to him, that takes place in this Justification of the ungodly, when, by the merit of the same holy passion, the love of God is diffused by the Holy Spirit in the hearts of those who are justified, and inheres in them. Hence, in Justification itself, along with the remission of sins, man receives, through Jesus Christ, in whom he is ingrafted, all these things infused at the same time, viz., faith, hope, and charity; for faith, unless hope and charity are added to it, neither unites perfectly with Christ, nor forms a living member of his body; for which reason it is most truly said that faith without works would be dead and inoperative, and that in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth anything, but faith which worketh by love. This faith, before the sacrament of baptism, catechumens, in accordance with the tradition of the Apostles, seek from the Church when they seek faith producing eternal life; which life faith cannot produce without hope and charity. Hence also they immediately hear the words of Christ, "If ye would enter into life, keep the commandments." Therefore, receiving true and Christian righteousness as a first robe, instead of that one which Adam lost by his disobedience—lost both for himself and for us—a fair and immaculate robe, presented to them by Jesus Christ, which, on being born again, they are enjoined to preserve,

that they may produce it before the tribunal of our Lord Jesus Christ, and have eternal life.

IN WHAT WAY IT IS TO BE UNDERSTOOD THAT THE UNGODLY MAN IS JUSTIFIED BY FAITH, AND FREELY.

IX. When the Apostle says that a man is Justified by Faith, and Freely, the words are to be understood in that sense which the perpetual sense of the Catholic Church has held and expressed, viz., that we are, therefore, said to be justified by faith, because faith is the beginning of salvation, the foundation and root of all justification, without which it is impossible to please God and attain to the fellowship of the Son of God. And we are said to be justified freely, because none of those things which precede justification, whether faith or works, merit the grace of justification itself; for if it be of grace, it is no longer of works, otherwise grace were no more grace.

AGAINST THE VAIN CONFIDENCE OF HERETICS.

X. But although it is necessary to believe that sins neither are remitted, nor have ever been remitted, except freely by the Divine mercy through Christ, it is not to be said to any one boasting a confidence and certainty of the forgiveness of his sins, that his sins are forgiven, or have been forgiven; seeing this vain confidence, totally remote from piety, may exist in heretics and schismatics, nay, in our own time does exist, and is extolled with great hostility to the Catholic Church. Neither is it to be asserted that it becomes those who are truly justified to determine with themselves, without any kind of doubt, that they are truly justified, and that no man is absolved from sin and justified, save he who assuredly believes that he is acquitted and justified, and that acquittal and justification are obtained by this faith alone; as if any one who does not believe this were doubting the promise of God and the efficacy of the death and resurrection of Christ. For as no pious man ought to doubt of the mercy of God, the merit of Christ, and the virtue and efficacy of

the sacraments, so every one, while he beholds his own weakness and disinclination, may be in fear and dread respecting his own gracious state; seeing that no man can know with a certainty of faith, as to which there can be no lurking error, that he has obtained the grace of God.

OF THE INCREASE OF RECEIVED JUSTIFICATION.

XI. Having been thus justified and become the friends and of the household of God, going on from strength to strength, they are, as the Apostle says, renewed from day to day, that is, mortifying the members of their flesh, and displaying those weapons of righteousness received from God for sanctification, by the observance of the commandments of God and of the Church in righteousness itself, through the grace of Jesus Christ. Faith co-operating with good works, they grow and are justified more and more, as it is written, "Let him who is just be justified still;" and again, "Fear not to be justified even unto death;" and again, "You see how a man is justified by works and not by faith only." This increase of righteousness the holy Church begs, when she prays, "Lord increase our faith, hope, and charity," &c.

OF THE OBSERVANCE OF THE COMMANDMENTS—ITS NECESSITY AND POSSIBILITY.

XII. No man, however justified, should think himself free from the observance of the Commandments; no man should use that presumptuous expression prohibited under anathema by the Fathers, that to a justified man the precepts of God are impossible of observance; for God does not order what is impossible, but by ordering admonishes you both to do what you can, and ask what you cannot, and assists, that you may be able to do. His commandments are not grievous; his yoke is easy, and his burden is light. For those who are of God love Christ, and those who love him, as he himself testifies, keep his commandments, as indeed they can do, with the Divine assistance. For in this mortal life, however just and holy they may be, they may fall into light

and daily sins, which are also called venial; and when they do fall they do not thereby cease to be righteous, for those words are used by the righteous, and are both humble and true, "Forgive us our debts." Hence it follows that the righteous ought to feel themselves under a greater obligation to walk in the way of righteousness, in that being freed from sin and become the servants of God, living soberly, righteously, and godly, they may be able to make progress through Jesus Christ, by whom they have access into that grace: for God does not forsake those once justified by his grace, unless he is previously forsaken by them.

Wherefore no man ought to flatter himself in Faith alone, thinking that by faith alone he has been appointed heir, and will obtain the inheritance, although he do not suffer with Christ, that he may also be glorified with him. For Christ himself, though he was the Son of God, learned obedience from the things which he suffered; and being made consummate, became the author of eternal life to all who obey him. Accordingly the Apostle himself admonishes the justified, saying, "Know you not that of those who run in a race all indeed run, but one receives the prize? So run that you may obtain. I therefore so run not as uncertainly, so fight not as beating the air; but I chastise my body and reduce it into subjection, lest when I have preached to others I should myself be made a reprobate." Again, Peter, the prince of the Apostles, says, "Endeavour by good works to make your calling and election sure, for so doing, you will never sin." Whence it is evident that those oppose the orthodox doctrine of religion who say that in every good work the religious man sins at least venially, or, what is more intolerable, deserves eternal punishment; as also those who hold that in all works the righteous sin, if, while stirring up their sluggishness, and exhorting themselves to run the race, they, though doing so primarily in order that God may be glorified, have also an eye to the eternal reward; seeing it is written, "I have inclined my heart to do thy righteousness, because of recompense;" and the Apostle says of Moses, that "he looked to the reward."

AS TO PREDESTINATION, IT IS NECESSARY TO GUARD AGAINST RASH PRESUMPTION.

XIII. No man also, so long as he lives in this mortal life, should presume so far on the secret mystery of Predestination as to determine for certain that he himself is in the number of the predestinated; as if it were true that a justified man can no more sin, or, if he sin, may promise himself certain repentance. For it cannot be known without special revelation who they are whom God has chosen to himself.

OF THE GIFT OF PERSEVERANCE.

XIV. The same is true in regard to the gift of Perseverance, of which it is written, "He who perseveres unto the end shall be saved:" a thing indeed which cannot be obtained anywhere else than from Him who is powerful to make him who stands stand perseveringly, and restore him who falls. Let no man promise himself anything with absolute certainty, although all ought to place and repose the firmest hope in the help of God. For God, if they themselves are not wanting to his grace, will, as he has begun the good work, also finish it, working in them to will and to do. Still let those who think they stand take heed lest they fall, and with fear and trembling work out their salvation, in labours, in vigils, and alms, in prayers and oblations, in fastings and chastity. For knowing that they have been born again to the hope of glory, but not yet to glory, they ought to be in fear concerning the contest which remains with the devil, the world, and the flesh; in which they cannot be victorious, unless, by the grace of God, they obey the Apostle when he says, "We are debtors not to the flesh to live after the flesh; for if ye live after the flesh ye shall die, but if by the Spirit ye mortify the deeds of the flesh, ye shall live."

OF THE LAPSED AND THEIR RECOVERY.

XV. Those who, after receiving the grace of Justification,

have fallen through sin, may again be justified, when God arousing them by the sacrament of penitence, they shall have succeeded, by the merit of Christ, in recovering lost grace. For this restoration of the fallen is a mode of justification, and has been aptly called by the Fathers a second plank after shipwreck of lost grace. For in behalf of those who fall into sin after baptism, Christ Jesus instituted the sacrament of penitence, where he says, "Receive the Holy Spirit: whose sins ye remit they are remitted to them, and whose sins ye retain they are retained." Whence it follows, that the penitence of a Christian man after a lapse is very different from the baptismal; and consists not only in a cessation from sin and detestation of it, or in a humbled and contrite heart, but also in a sacramental confession of sin, to be made at least in wish, and in its own time, and in sacerdotal absolution; likewise in satisfaction by fasting, alms, prayer, and other pious exercises of the spiritual life: not indeed for the eternal punishment, which even by a wish for the sacrament is remitted along with the guilt, but the temporal punishment, which, as the Scriptures say, is not always, as in baptism, entirely remitted to those who, ungrateful for the grace of God which they received, have grieved the Holy Spirit, and not feared to pollute the temple of God. Of this penitence it is written, "Remember, whenever ye have fallen, repent and do the first works." Again, "The sorrow which is according to God worketh repentance for a stable salvation." And again, "Repent, and bring forth fruits worthy of repentance."

THAT BY ANY MORTAL SIN GRACE IS LOST, BUT NOT FAITH.

XVI. In opposition to the craftiness of certain men who, by smooth speeches and fair words, seduce the hearts of the simple, it is to be asserted, that not only by unbelief, by which even faith itself is lost, but also by any other mortal sin, though faith is not lost, the Grace received in justification is lost: thus defending the doctrine of the Divine law, which excludes from the kingdom of heaven, not only unbelievers, but also believers who are fornicators, adulterers,

effeminate, abusers of themselves with mankind, thieves, misers, drunkards, evil speakers, plunderers, and all others who commit deadly sins, from which, by the help of Divine grace, they are able to abstain, and the effect of which is to separate them from the grace of Christ.

OF THE FRUIT OF JUSTIFICATION, THAT IS, OF THE MERIT OF GOOD WORKS, AND OF THE NATURE OF MERIT ITSELF.

XVII. To men justified in this way, whether they have constantly preserved the grace received, or recovered it when lost, are to be set forth these words of the Apostle, "Abound in every good work, knowing that your labour is not in vain in the Lord; for God is not unjust to forget your work and love which ye have shewn in his name:" and "Lose not your confidence, which has great recompense." To those, therefore, who work well even unto the end and hope in God, is to be held forth eternal life both as a gift mercifully promised to the children of God through Jesus Christ, and as a reward faithfully to be paid according to the promise of God to their good works and merits. For this is the crown of righteousness, which, after their contest and race, is, as the Apostle says, set apart for them, to be bestowed on them by the just Judge, and not only on them, but on all who love his advent. For seeing that Christ himself, as the head to the members and the vine to the branches, is perpetually infusing his virtue into the justified—a virtue which always precedes, accompanies, and follows their good works, and without these works cannot in any way be agreeable to God and meritorious, it must be believed that nothing more is wanting to the justified to enable them by those works which are done in God, fully to satisfy the Divine law according to the state of this life, and truly to merit the obtaining of eternal life in due time, provided they die in grace: since Christ our Saviour says, "If any one drink of the water which I will give him, he shall never thirst, but it will become in him a fountain of water springing up unto everlasting life." Thus neither is our own righteousness established as if it were properly of us, nor is the righteousness

of God overlooked or repudiated: for the righteousness which is called ours, inasmuch as by it inhering in us we are justified, is also the righteousness of God, because infused into us by God through the merits of Christ.

This, however, must not be omitted. Although so much is attributed to good works in Scripture, that Christ promises that he who has given a cup of cold water to one of his disciples shall not go unrewarded, and the Apostle testifies that our light momentary tribulation at present is working in us an exceedingly sublime, an eternal weight of glory; far be it from any Christian man to confide or glory in himself, and not in the Lord, whose goodness towards all men is so great that he is pleased to regard his own gifts as their merits. And as we all offend in many things, every one of us ought to have before his eyes, besides mercy and goodness, judgment and severity; nor ought any one, though he may not be conscious of anything, to judge himself, since the whole lives of men must be tried and judged not by human judgment, but by the judgment of God, who will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and manifest the counsels of the heart: and then shall every one have praise of God, who, as it is written, will render to every man according to his works.

After this Catholic doctrine of Justification, which, unless a man believe faithfully and firmly, he cannot be justified, it has pleased the Holy Council to subjoin the following Canons, that all may know not only what they ought to hold and follow, but also what to shun and avoid.

CANONS.

I. Whosoever shall say that a man can be justified by his works, which are done either by the powers of human nature or the teaching of the law without divine grace through Christ, let him be anathema.

II. Whosoever shall say that Divine grace by Jesus Christ is given for this purpose only, that men may be able to live righteously and merit eternal life, as if he could do both by

free-will without grace, though scarcely and with difficulty, let him be anathema.

III. Whosoever shall say that without the preventing inspiration of the Holy Spirit and His assistance, man can believe, hope, love, or repent, so that the grace of justification behoves to be conferred upon him, let him be anathema.

IV. Whosoever shall say that the free-will of man, moved and excited by God, does not at all co-operate with God when exciting and calling, that thus he may dispose and prepare himself for obtaining the grace of justification, and that he cannot dissent though he wills it, but like something inanimate does nothing at all, and acts passively merely, let him be anathema.

V. Whosoever shall say that the free-will of man was lost and extinguished after Adam's sin, or that it is a thing of name merely, or a name without a thing, in short, a figment introduced into the Church by Satan, let him be anathema.

VI. Whosoever shall say that it is not in the power of man to make his ways evil, but that God produces bad works as well as good, not permissively only, but properly and of himself, so that the treachery of Judas is no less his proper work than the calling of Paul, let him be anathema.

VII. Whosoever shall say that all the works which are done before justification, on whatever account they may be done, are truly sins, and deserve the hatred of God, or that the more vehemently a man tries to dispose himself for grace, the more grievously he sins, let him be anathema.

VIII. Whosoever shall say that the fear of hell, by which we flee to the mercy of God, grieving for our sins, or by which we abstain from sinning, is sin, or makes sinners worse, let him be anathema.

IX. Whosoever shall say that the wicked is justified by faith alone, in such a sense that nothing else is required in the way of co-operation to obtain the grace of justification, and that it is in no respect necessary that he be prepared and disposed by the movement of his own will, let him be anathema.

X. Whosoever shall say that men are justified without the righteousness of Christ, by which He merited for us, or

that by that righteousness they are formally righteous, let him be anathema.

XI. Whosoever shall say that men are justified by the mere imputation of Christ's righteousness, or by the mere remission of sins, exclusive of grace and charity which is shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Spirit, and is inherent in them, or also, that the grace by which we are justified is only the favour of God, let him be anathema.

XII. Whosoever shall say that justifying faith is nothing else than trust in the Divine mercy forgiving sins by Christ, or that this trust is the only thing by which we are justified, let him be anathema.

XIII. Whosoever shall say that for any man to obtain the remission of sins, it is necessary to believe for a certainty and without any hesitancy, as to his own weakness and disinclination that his sins are forgiven, let him be anathema.

XIV. Whosoever shall say that a man is absolved from his sins, or justified by the mere circumstance of believing for a certainty that he is absolved or justified, or that no man is truly justified save he who believes that he is justified, and that acquittal and absolution are accomplished by faith alone, let him be anathema.

XV. Whosoever shall say that a man regenerated or justified, is bound in faith to believe that he is certainly in the number of the predestinated, let him be anathema.

XVI. Whosoever shall say that he holds it absolutely and infallibly certain that he shall have the great gift of perseverance even unto the end, if he has not learned this by special revelation, let him be anathema.

XVII. Whosoever shall say that the grace of justification falls to none but those predestinated unto life, and that all others who are called are called indeed, but do not receive grace, as being predestinated by the Divine power to evil, let him be anathema.

XVIII. Whosoever shall say that the commandments of God are impossible of observance even to a justified man, and to one constituted under grace, let him be anathema.

XIX. Whosoever shall say that nothing is commanded in the gospel except faith; that other things are indifferent,

being neither commanded nor prohibited, but free; or that the ten commandments do not apply to Christians, let him be anathema.

XX. Whosoever shall say that a justified man, however perfect, is not bound to the observance of the commandments of God and the Church, but only to believe as if the gospel were a naked and absolute promise of eternal life, without the condition of observing the commandments, let him be anathema.

XXI. Whosoever shall say that Jesus Christ was given by God to man as a Redeemer in whom they may trust, but not as a lawgiver whom they are to obey, let him be anathema.

XXII. Whosoever shall say that a justified man, even without the special assistance of God, is able to persevere in received righteousness, or with the assistance of God is not able, let him be anathema.

XXIII. Whosoever shall say that a man once justified cannot sin any more or lose grace, and therefore that he who falls or sins was never truly justified, or that he is able during his whole life to avoid all sins, even venial, unless it be by the special privilege of God, as the Church holds concerning the blessed Virgin, let him be anathema.

XXIV. Whosoever shall say that received righteousness is not preserved and even is not increased in the view of God by good works, that works themselves are only the fruits and signs of justification obtained, but not the cause of increasing it, let him be anathema.

XXV. Whosoever shall say that in every work whatever the just man sins, at least venially, or, which is more intolerable, mortally, and thereby deserves eternal punishment, let him be anathema.

XXVI. Whosoever shall say that the righteous ought not, for the good works which may have been done in God, to expect and hope for eternal recompense from God through his mercy and the merits of Jesus Christ, if he persevere even to the end in well-doing and in keeping the Divine commandments, let him be anathema.

XXVII. Whosoever shall say that there is no mortal sin

but that of unbelief, and that by no sin, however grievous and enormous, save that of infidelity, can grace once received be lost, let him be anathema.

XXVIII. Whosoever shall say that grace being lost by sin, faith is lost at the same time and for ever, or that the faith which remains is not true faith, though it be not lively, or that he who has faith without charity is not a Christian, let him be anathema.

XXIX. Whosoever shall say that he who has fallen after baptism cannot rise again by the grace of God, or that he may indeed, but by faith alone, recover lost righteousness without the sacrament of penitence, as the Holy Roman and Universal Church taught by Christ the Lord and his Apostles hath hitherto professed, observed, and taught, let him be anathema.

XXX. Whosoever shall say that after the grace of justification has been received, the guilt or liability to eternal punishment is so remitted to every penitent sinner, that no liability to temporal punishment remains to be discharged either in this world or in the next in purgatory, before he can obtain access to the kingdom of heaven, let him be anathema.

XXXI. Whosoever shall say that a justified man sins when he does good works with a view to eternal reward, let him be anathema.

XXXII. Whosoever shall say that the good works of a justified man are in such a sense the gifts of God, that they are not good merits of the justified man himself, or that a justified man by good works which are done by him through the grace of God and the merits of Jesus Christ, of which he is a living member, does not truly merit increase of grace, eternal life, and the actual attainment of eternal life if he die in grace, together with increase of glory, let him be anathema.

XXXIII. Whosoever shall say that this Catholic doctrine of justification expressed by the Holy Council in this present decree, derogates in any respect from the glory of God or the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ, and does not rather illustrate the truth of our faith, in short, the glory of God and of Jesus Christ, let him be anathema

On the Sixth Session of the Council of Trent.

The doctrine of man's Justification would be easily explained, did not the false opinions by which the minds of men are preoccupied, spread darkness over the clear light. The principal cause of obscurity, however, is, that we are with the greatest difficulty induced to leave the glory of righteousness entire to God alone. For we always desire to be somewhat, and such is our folly, we even think we are. As this pride was innate in man from the first, so it opened a door for Satan to imbue them with many impious and vicious conceits with which we have this day to contend. And in all ages there have been sophists exercising their pen in extolling human righteousness, as they knew it would be popular. When by the singular kindness of God, the impiety of Pelagius was repudiated with the common consent of the ancient Church, they no longer dared to talk so pertly of human merit. They, however, devised a middle way, by which they might not give God the whole in justification, and yet give something.

This is the moderation which the venerable Fathers adopt to correct the errors on Justification, which, they say, have arisen in our day. Such indeed is their mode of prefacing, that at the outset they breathe nothing but Christ; but when they come to the subject, far are they from leaving him what is his own. Nay, their definition at length contains nothing else than the trite dogma of the schools: that men are justified partly by the grace of God and partly by their own works; thus only shewing themselves somewhat more modest than Pelagius was.

This will easily be shewn to be the fact. For under the *second* head, where they treat of Original Sin, they declare that free-will, though impaired in its powers and biassed, is not however extinguished. I will not dispute about a name, but since they contend that liberty has by no means been extinguished, they certainly understand that the human will has still some power left to choose good. For where

death is not, there is at least some portion of life. They themselves remove all ambiguity when they call it impaired and biassed. Therefore, if we believe them, Original Sin has weakened us, so that the defect of our will is not pravity but weakness. For if the will were wholly depraved, its health would not only be impaired but lost until it were renewed. The latter, however, is uniformly the doctrine of Scripture. To omit innumerable passages where Paul discourses on the nature of the human race, he does not charge free-will with weakness, but declares all men to be useless, alienated from God, and enslaved to the tyranny of sin; so much so, that he says they are unfit to think a good thought. (Rom. iii. 12; 2 Cor. iii. 5.) We do not however deny, that a will, though bad, remains in man. For the fall of Adam did not take away the will, but made it a slave where it was free. It is not only prone to sin, but is made subject to sin. Of this subject we shall again speak by and bye.

The *third* and *fourth* heads I do not touch. Towards the end of the *fifth* head they affirm that no transference to a state of grace takes place without Baptism, or a wish for it. Would it not have been better to say, that by the word and sacraments Christ is communicated, or, if they prefer so to speak, applied to us, than to make mention of baptism alone? But they have been pleased to exclude infants from the kingdom of God, who have been snatched away before they could be offered for baptism. As if nothing were meant when it is said that the children of believers are born holy. (1 Cor. vii. 14.) Nay, on what ground do we admit them to baptism unless that they are the heirs of promise? For did not the promise of life apply to them it would be a profanation of baptism to give it to them. But if God has adopted them into his kingdom, how great injustice is done to his promise, as if it were not of itself sufficient for their salvation! A contrary opinion, I admit, has prevailed, but it is unjust to bury the truth of God under any human error, however ancient. The salvation of infants is included in the promise in which God declares to believers that he will be a God to them and to their seed. In this way he declared, that those deriving descent from Abraham were born

to him. (Gen. xvii. 7.) In virtue of this promise they are admitted to baptism, because they are considered members of the Church. Their salvation, therefore, has not its commencement in baptism, but being already founded on the word, is sealed by baptism. But these definition-mongers thrust forward the passage, "Unless a man be born of water and of the Spirit." (John iii. 3.) First, assuming with them that water means baptism, who will concede to them that it moreover means a wish to receive baptism? But were I to say that the passage has a different meaning, and were I following some ancient expositors to take the term *water* for *mortification*, they would not, I presume, be so bitter as therefore to judge me heretical. I interpret it, however, as added by way of epithet to express the nature and power of the Spirit. Nor can they make out that water here means baptism, any more than that fire means some sacrament, when it is said, "In the Holy Spirit and fire." (Matt. iii. 11.) See on what grounds they arrogate to themselves supreme authority in interpreting Scripture!

In the *sixth* head, they assert that we are prepared by the grace of God for receiving Justification, but they assign to this grace the office of exciting and assisting, we ourselves freely co-operating; in other words, we are here treated with the inanities which the sophists are wont to babble in the schools. But I ask, Is it the same thing to excite a will, and aid it when in itself weak, as to form a new heart in man, so as to make him willing? Let them answer, then, whether creating a new heart, and making a heart of flesh out of a heart of stone, (both of which the Scripture declares that God does in us,) is nothing else than to supply what is wanting to a weak will. But if they are not moved by these passages, let them say whether he who makes us to be willing simply assists the will. Paul claims the whole work for God; they ascribe nothing to him but a little help. But for what do they join man as an associate with God? Because man, though he might repudiate it, freely accepts the grace of God and the illumination of the Holy Spirit. How greatly do they detract from the work of God as described by the Prophet!—"I will put my law,"

says he, "in your hearts, and make you to walk in my precepts." Jer. xxxii. 39; Ezek. xxxvi. 27; Heb. viii. 10; x. 16.

Is this the doctrine delivered by Augustine, when he says, "Men labour to find in our will some good thing of our own not given us of God; what they can find I know not?" (Aug. Lib. de Precator. Merit. et Remiss. 2.) Indeed, as he elsewhere says, "Were man left to his own will to remain under the help of God if he chooses, while God does not make him willing, among temptations so numerous and so great, the will would succumb from its own weakness. Succour, therefore, has been brought to the weakness of the human will by divine grace acting irresistibly and inseparably, that thus the will however weak might not fail." (Aug. de Corruptione et Gratia.) But the Neptunian fathers, in a new smithy, forge what was unknown to Augustine, viz., that the reception of grace is not of God, inasmuch as it is by the free movement of our own will we assent to God calling. This is repugnant to Scripture, which makes God the author of a good will. It is one thing for the will to be moved by God to obey if it pleases, and another for it to be formed to be good. Moreover, God promises not to act so that we may be able to will well, but to make us will well. Nay, he goes farther when he says, "I will make you to walk;" as was carefully observed by Augustine. The same thing is affirmed by Paul when he teaches, that "it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure." The hallucination of these Fathers is in dreaming that we are offered a movement which leaves us an intermediate choice, while they never think of that effectual working by which the heart of man is renewed from pravity to rectitude. But this effectual working of the Holy Spirit is described in the thirty-second chapter of Jeremiah, where he thus speaks in the name of God, "I will put the fear of my name into their hearts, that they decline not from my commandments." In short, their error lies in making no distinction between the grace of Regeneration, which now comes to the succour of our wretchedness, and the first grace which had been given to Adam. This Augustine carefully expounds. "Through Christ the Mediator," he says, "God makes those who were

wicked to be good for ever after. The first man had not that grace by which he could never wish to be bad; for the help given him was of that nature that he might abandon it when he would, and remain in it if he would, but it was not such as to make him willing. The grace of the second Adam is more powerful. It makes us will, will so strongly and love so ardently, that by the will of the spirit we overcome the will of the flesh lusting against it." A little farther on he says, "Through this grace of God in receiving good and persevering therein, there is in us a power not only to be able to do what we will, but to will what we are able." (Aug. Lib. ad Bonif. 2, c. 8.) Although the subject is too long to be despatched thus briefly, I feel confident that my statement, though short, will suffice with readers of sense to refute these fancies.

But they pretend that they have also the support of Scripture. For when it is said, "Turn thou me, O Lord, and I shall be turned," (Jer. xxxi. 18,) they infer that there is a preventing grace given to men: and, on the other hand, out of the words, "Turn ye unto me, and I will turn unto you," they extract the power of free-will. I am aware that Augustine uses this distinction, but it is in a very different sense: For he distinctly declares, and that in numerous passages, that the grace of God so works in us as to make us willing or unwilling, whence he concludes that man does no good thing which God does not do in him. (Aug. Lib. ad Bonif. 3, c. 8.) What then, you will ask, does Augustine mean when he speaks of the freedom of the will? Just what he so often repeats, that men are not forced by the grace of God against their will, but ruled voluntarily, so as to obey and follow of their own accord, and this because their will from being bad is turned to good. Hence he says, "We therefore will, but God works in us also to will. We work, but God causes us also to work." Again, "The good which we possess not without our own will we should never possess unless he worked in us also to will." Again, "It is certain that we will when we are willing, but he makes us to be willing. It is certain that we do when we do, but he makes us to do by affording most effectual strength to the will."

(Aug. Lib. ii. de Bon. Persev. cap. 13; Lib. ii. 23, de Grat. et Liber. Arbit.) The whole may be thus summed up—Their error consists in sharing the work between God and ourselves, so as to transfer to ourselves the obedience of a pious will in assenting to divine grace, whereas this is the proper work of God himself.

But they insist on the words of the Prophet, that in requiring conversion from us he addresses free-will, which he would do in vain (that is, in their opinion) unless free-will were something. I admit that expressions of this kind would be absurd if there were not some will in man, but I do not therefore concede that the free faculty of obeying may be thence inferred. Those venerable Fathers must be the merest of novices if they form their estimate of what man is able to do from the commandments given him, seeing that God requires of us what is above our strength for the very purpose of convincing us of our imbecility, and divesting us of all pride. Let us remember, therefore, that will in man is one thing, and the free choice of good and evil another: for freedom of choice having been taken away after the fall of the first man, will alone was left; but so completely captive under the tyranny of sin, that it is only inclined to evil.

Moreover, not to dwell longer here, I say that the doctrine here delivered by the Fathers of Trent is at open war with our Saviour's words, "Whosoever hath heard of the Father, cometh unto me." (John vi. 45.) For as Augustine wisely observes, it hence follows, that no man hears and learns of God without at the same time believing on Christ; and that the motion of the Holy Spirit is so efficacious that it always begets faith. They, on the contrary, place it in the option of man to listen to the inspiration of God, if he will! It is impossible to reconcile the two things—that all who have learned of God believe in Christ, and that the inspiration of God is not effectual and complete unless men of themselves assent to it. We have the Son of God, who is never at variance with himself, for the author of the former. To whom shall we ascribe the latter, which is utterly contrary to it, but to the father of lies?

After treating, under the *seventh* head, of The Mode of Preparation, so frigidly that every one but a savourless Papist must feel ashamed of such senselessness, they at length, under the *eighth* head, when they come to define, set out with cautioning us against supposing that the justification of man consists in faith alone. The verbal question is, What is Justification? They deny that it is merely the forgiveness of sins, and insist that it includes both renovation and sanctification. Let us see whether this is true. Paul's words are, "David describeth the blessedness of the man to whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven." (Rom. iv. 6; Psalm xxxii. 1.) If, from this passage of David, Paul duly extracts a definition of gratuitous righteousness, it follows that it consists in the forgiveness of sins. Paul interprets thus—David calls him righteous to whom God imputeth righteousness by not imputing sin; and the same Apostle, without appealing to the testimony of another, elsewhere says, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing unto men their trespasses." Immediately after, he adds, "He made him who knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might be the righteousness of God in him." (2 Cor. v. 19.) Can anything be clearer than that we are regarded as righteous in the sight of God, because our sins have been expiated by Christ, and no longer hold us under liability?

There is no room for the vulgar quibble that Paul is speaking of the beginning of Justification; for in both places he is shewing, not how men who had hitherto been unbelievers begin to be righteous, but how they retain the righteousness which they have once procured during the whole course of life; for David speaks of himself after he had been adopted among the children of God; and Paul asserts that this is the perpetual message which is daily heard in the Church. In the same sense also he says, "Moses describeth the righteousness of the law, that he who doeth these things shall live in them, (Lev. xviii. 5;) but the righteousness of faith thus speaketh, He that believeth," &c. (Rom. x. 5.) We thus see that the righteousness of faith, which by no

means consists of works, is opposed to the righteousness of the law, which so consists. The words have the same meaning as those which, as Luke tells us, Paul used to the people of Antioch, "By this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and every one who believeth in him is justified from all the things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." (Acts xiii. 38.) For justification is added to forgiveness of sins by way of interpretation, and without doubt means *acquittal.* It is denied to the works of the law; and that it may be gratuitous, it is said to be obtained by faith. What! can the justification of the publican have any other meaning (Luke xvii.) than the imputation of righteousness, when he was freely accepted of God? And since the dispute is concerning the propriety of a word, when Christ is declared by Paul to be our righteousness and sanctification, a distinction is certainly drawn between these two things, though the Fathers of Trent confound them. For if there is a twofold grace, inasmuch as Christ both justifies and sanctifies us, righteousness does not include under it renovation of life. When it is said, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?—It is God that justifieth"—it is impossible to understand anything else than gratuitous acceptance.

I would be unwilling to dispute about a word, did not the whole case depend upon it. But when they say that a man is justified, when he is again formed for the obedience of God, they subvert the whole argument of Paul, "If righteousness is by the law, faith is nullified, and the promise abolished." (Rom. iv. 14.) For he means, that not an individual among mankind will be found in whom the promise of salvation may be accomplished, if it involves the condition of innocence; and that faith, if it is propped up by works, will instantly fall. This is true; because, so long as we look at what we are in ourselves, we must tremble in the sight of God, so far from having a firm and unshaken confidence of eternal life. I speak of the regenerate; for how far from righteousness is that newness of life which is begun here below?

It is not to be denied, however, that the two things,

Justification and Sanctification, are constantly conjoined and cohere; but from this it is erroneously inferred that they are one and the same. For example:—The light of the sun, though never unaccompanied with heat, is not to be considered heat. Where is the man so undiscerning as not to distinguish the one from the other? We acknowledge, then, that as soon as any one is justified, renewal also necessarily follows: and there is no dispute as to whether or not Christ sanctifies all whom he justifies. It were to rend the gospel, and divide Christ himself, to attempt to separate the righteousness which we obtain by faith from repentance.

The whole dispute is as to The Cause of Justification. The Fathers of Trent pretend that it is twofold, as if we were justified partly by forgiveness of sins and partly by spiritual regeneration; or, to express their view in other words, as if our righteousness were composed partly of imputation, partly of quality. I maintain that it is one, and simple, and is wholly included in the gratuitous acceptance of God. I besides hold that it is without us, because we are righteous in Christ only. Let them produce evidence from Scripture, if they have any, to convince us of their doctrine. I, while I have the whole Scripture supporting me, will now be satisfied with this one reason, viz., that when mention is made of the righteousness of works, the law and the gospel place it in the perfect obedience of the law; and as that nowhere appears, they leave us no alternative but to flee to Christ alone, that we may be regarded as righteous in him, not being so in ourselves. Will they produce to us one passage which declares that begun newness of life is approved by God as righteousness either in whole or in part? But if they are devoid of authority, why may we not be permitted to repudiate the figment of partial justification which they here obtrude?

Moreover, how frivolous and nugatory the division of causes enumerated by them is, I omit to shew, except that I neither can nor ought to let pass the very great absurdity of calling Baptism alone the instrumental cause. What then will become of the gospel? Will it not even be allowed to occupy the smallest corner? But baptism is the sacrament

of faith. Who denies it? Yet, when all has been said, it must still be granted me that it is nothing else than an appendage of the gospel. They, therefore, act preposterously in assigning it the first place, and act just as any one who should call a mason's trowel the instrumental cause of a house! Unquestionably, whosoever postponing the gospel enumerates baptism among the causes of salvation, by so doing gives proof that he knows not what baptism is, what its force, its office, or its use. What else I wish to say of the formal cause will be said on the tenth Canon. Here I wish only to advert to what belongs to the present place. For they again affirm that we are truly righteous, and not merely counted so. I, on the contrary, while I admit that we are never received into the favour of God without being at the same time regenerated to holiness of life, contend that it is false to say that any part of righteousness (justification) consists *in quality*, or in the habit which resides in us, and that we are righteous (justified) only by gratuitous acceptance. For when the Apostle teaches that "by the obedience of one many were made righteous," (Rom. vi. 19,) he sufficiently shews, if I mistake not, that the righteousness wanting in ourselves is borrowed elsewhere. And in the first chapter to the Ephesians, where he says that we are adopted to the predestination of sons of God, that we might be accepted in the Beloved, he comprehends the whole of our righteousness. For however small the portion attributed to our work, to that extent faith will waver, and our whole salvation be endangered. Wherefore, let us learn with the Apostle to lay aside our own righteousness, which is of the law, as a noxious impediment, that we may lay hold of that which is of the faith of Jesus Christ. (Phil. iii. 9.) Of what nature this is we have abundantly shewn; and Paul intimates in a single sentence in the third chapter to the Galatians, that the righteousness of the law, because it consists of works, has no congruity with the righteousness of faith.

But what can you do with men like these? For after they have enumerated many causes of Justification, forgetting that they were treating of the cause of justification, they infer that righteousness partly consists of works, because no man

is reconciled to God by Christ without the Spirit of regeneration. How gross the delusion! It is just as if they were to say, that forgiveness of sins cannot be dissevered from repentance, and therefore repentance is a part of it. The only point in dispute is, how we are deemed righteous in the sight of God, and where our faith, by which alone we obtain righteousness, ought to seek it? Though they should repeat a thousand times, that we cannot share in the merit of Christ's passion, without being at the same time regenerated by his Spirit, they will not make it cease to be a fundamental principle; that God is propitious to us because he was appeased by the death of Christ; and that we are counted righteous in his sight, because by that sacrifice our transgressions were expiated. "We have propitiation," says Paul, "through faith in the blood of Christ." (Rom. iii. 25; v. 11.) In fine, when the cause is inquired into, of what use is it to obtrude an inseparable accident? Let them cease then to sport with trifles, or trifle with quibbles such as—man receives faith, and along with it hope and love; therefore it is not faith alone that justifies. Because if eyes are given us, and along with them ears and feet and hands, we cannot therefore say that we either hear with our feet or walk with our hands, or handle with our eyes. Of the erroneous application of a passage of Paul I shall speak elsewhere.

Next follows their approbation of the worse than worthless distinction between an informal and a formed Faith. The venerable Fathers, indeed, are ashamed to use the very terms, but while they stammer out that man is not united to Christ by faith alone, unless hope and charity are added, they are certainly dreaming of that faith, devoid of charity, which is commonly called by the sophists informal. They thus betray their gross incapacity. For if the doctrine of Paul is true, that "Christ dwells in our hearts by faith," (Eph. iii. 17,) they can no more separate faith from charity than Christ from his Spirit. If "our hearts are purified by faith," as Peter affirms, (Acts xv. 9,) if "whosoever believeth hath eternal life," as our Saviour so often declares, (John iii. 16; v. 24; vi. 40; xx. 31,) if the inheritance of eternal life is obtained by faith, (Rom. v. 14,) faith is something very dif-

ferent from all forms of dead persuasion. They deny that we are made living members of Christ by faith. How much better Augustine, who calls faith the life of the soul, as the soul is the life of the body? (Aug. in Joan. c. 11,) although Augustine is not so much the authority to be quoted here as Paul, who acknowledges that he lives by the faith of Christ. (Gal. ii. 20.) They should perhaps be pardoned this error, because they talk about faith as they might do of fabulous islands, (for who among them knows by the slightest experience what faith is?) were it not that they drag the miserable world along with them in the same ignorance to destruction!

Let us remember that the nature of Faith is to be estimated from Christ. For that which God offers to us in Christ we receive only by faith. Hence, whatever Christ is to us is transferred to faith, which makes us capable of receiving both Christ and all his blessings. There would be no truth in the words of John, that faith is the victory by which we overcome the world, (1 John v. 4,) did it not ingraft us into Christ, (John xvi. 33,) who is the only conqueror of the world. It is worth while to remark their stupidity. When they quote the passage of Paul, "Faith which worketh by love," (Gal. v. 6,) they do not see that they are cutting their own throats. For if love is the fruit and effect of faith, who sees not that the informal faith which they have fabricated is a vain figment? It is very odd for the daughter thus to kill the mother! But I must remind my readers that that passage is irrelevantly introduced into a question about Justification, since Paul is not there considering in what respect faith or charity avails to justify a man, but what is Christian perfection; as when he elsewhere says, "If a man be in Christ he is a new creature." (2 Cor. v. 17.)

It were long and troublesome to note every blunder, but there is one too important to be omitted. They add, "that when catechumens ask faith from the Church, the answer is, 'If you will enter into life, keep the commandments.'" (Matt. xix. 17.) Wo to their catechumens, if so hard a condition is laid upon them! For what else is this but to lay them under an eternal curse, since they acknowledge

with Paul, that all are under the curse who are subject to the law? (Gal. iii. 10.) But they have the authority of Christ! I wish they would observe to what intent Christ thus spake. This can only be ascertained from the context, and the character of the persons. He to whom Christ replies had asked, What must I do to have eternal life? Assuredly, whosoever wishes to merit life by works, has a rule prescribed to him by the law, "This do, and thou shalt live." But attention must be paid to the object of this as intimated by Paul, viz., that man experiencing his powers, or rather convinced of his powerlessness, may lay aside his pride, and flee all naked to Christ. There is no room for the righteousness of faith until we have discovered that it is in vain that salvation is promised us by the law. But that which the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God performed by his own Son, by expiating our sins through the sacrifice of his death, so that his righteousness is fulfilled in us. But so preposterous are the Fathers of Trent, that while it is the office of Moses to lead us by the hand to Christ, (Gal. iii. 24,) they lead us away from the grace of Christ to Moses.

Lest they should not be liberal enough in preaching up the powers of man, they again repeat, under this head, that the Spirit of God acts in us according to the proper disposedness and co-operation of each. What disposedness, pray, will the Spirit of God find in stony hearts? Are they not ashamed to feign a disposedness, when the Spirit himself uniformly declares in Scripture that all things are contrary? For the commencement of grace is to make those willing who were unwilling, and therefore repugnant; so that faith, as well in its beginnings as its increase, even to its final perfection, is the gift of God; and the preparation for receiving grace is the free election of God, as Augustine says, (Lib. i. de Prædest., Sanct. c. 9-11.) And the words of Paul are clear, "God hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings, according as he hath chosen us in Christ, according to the good pleasure of his will." (Eph. i. 3.) By these words he certainly restrains us, while receiving so great a blessing from God, from glorying in the decision of our will,

as Augustine again says. (Ibid. c. 8.) This which man ought to receive as at the hands of God, is he to oppose to him as a merit of his own? For whence is there a first disposition, unless because we are the sheep of Christ! And who dare presume so far as to say he makes himself a sheep? Accordingly, when Luke speaks of effectual calling, he tells us that not those who were disposed of themselves, but those who were pre-ordained to eternal life, believed. (Acts xiii. 48.) And Paul acquaints us whence a right disposition is, when he teaches that the good works in which we walk were prepared by God. (Eph. ii. 10.) Let us hear Augustine, whose doctrine is very different, rather than those babblers. "After the fall of man," he says, (Lib. ii. de Bono Persev., c. 9,) "God was pleased that man's approach to him should be the effect only of his grace, and that man's not withdrawing from him should also be the effect only of his grace." For it is he himself who promises that he will give us a heart that we may understand, and ears that we may hear. Wherefore it is His grace alone which makes the difference, as Paul reminds us. Let me conclude by again using the words of Augustine, "The human will obtains not grace by freedom, but freedom by grace, and in order that it may persevere, delectable perpetuity and insuperable fortitude." (Lib. de Corrupt. et Grat. c. 8.)

In the *ninth* chapter, while they desire to shew some signs of modesty, they rather betray their effrontery. Seeing that the doctrine of Scripture was obviously repugnant to their decrees, they, to prevent this from being suspected, first explain what it is for a man to be justified by faith, saying, that faith is the beginning of salvation, and the foundation of justification. As if they had disentangled themselves by this solution, they immediately fly off to another—that the Apostle teaches that we are justified freely, because all the things which precede justification, whether faith or works, do not merit it. Did they think they are engaged in a serious matter, would they perform it as giddily as if they were playing at see-saw? I say nothing of their disregard of the judgments of mankind, as if they had expected to put out the eyes of all by such a sacred dogma as this—Faith justi-

fies, since it begins justification. First, this comment is repugnant to common sense. For what can be more childish than to restrict the whole effect to the mere act of beginning?

But let us see for a little whether the words of Paul allow themselves to be so easily wrested. "The gospel," he says, (Rom. i. 16,) "is the power of God to every one believing unto salvation; for therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith." Who sees not that here the beginning and the end are alike included? Were it otherwise, it would have been said, from "faith to works," as they would finish what faith begins. To the same effect is the testimony of Habakkuk, "The just shall live by faith." (Hab. ii. 4.) This would be improperly said did not faith perpetuate life. In the person of Abraham the chief mirror of justification is held forth. Let us see, then, at what time faith is declared to have been imputed to him for righteousness. (Gen. xv. 6; Gal. iii. 6.) He was certainly not a novice, but having left his country, had for several years followed the Lord, so that he was no common exemplar of holiness and all virtue. Faith therefore does not open up an access to him to righteousness, in order that his justification may afterwards be completed elsewhere. And Paul at length concludes that we stand in the grace which we have obtained by faith. (Rom. v. 2.) As far as a fixed and immovable station is from a transient passage, so far are they in this dogma of theirs from the meaning of Paul. To collect all the passages of Scripture were tedious and superfluous. From these few, I presume, it is already superabundantly clear, that the completion, not less than the commencement of justification, must be ascribed to faith.

The second branch is, that Justification is said by Paul to be gratuitous, because no merit precedes it. What then? When Paul also exclaims that all glorying of the flesh is excluded by the law of faith, is he looking only to the merits of past life, and does he not rather remind us that men justified by faith have nothing in which they can glory to the very end of life? For when he asserts after David that righteousness is imputed without works, he declares what is the perpetual state of believers. (Rom. iii. 27; iv. 2.) In

like manner David exclaims, that himself and all the other children of God are blessed by the remission of sins, not for one day, but for the whole of life. (Psalm xxxii. 1.) Nor does Peter, in the Acts, speak of the justification of a single day, when he says, "We believe that through the grace of Jesus Christ we are saved, as did also our fathers." (Acts xv. 11.) The question under discussion was, whether observance of the law was to be exacted of the Gentiles. He says it ought not, because there is no other salvation in the Christian Church than through the grace of Christ, and there never was any other. (Acts iv. 12.) And justly; for, as Paul says, the promise will not be secure unless it depends on the grace of God and on faith. (Rom. iv. 16.) Will they pretend that he is here, too, speaking of preceding merits? Nay, he declares that the greatest saints can have no assurance of salvation, unless it repose on the grace of Christ. He therefore abolishes faith who does not retain his as the only righteousness, which exists even until death.

We are justified freely, they say, because no works which precede justification merit it. But when Paul takes away all ground of glorying from Abraham, on the ground that faith was imputed to him for righteousness, he immediately subjoins by way of proof—where works are, there a due reward is paid, whereas what is given to faith is gratuitous. Let us observe that he is speaking of the holy Patriarch. Paul affirms, that at the time when he renounced the world to devote himself entirely to God, he was not justified by any works. If these spurious Fathers object, that it was then only he began to be justified, the quibble is plainly refuted by the context of the Sacred History. He had for many years exercised himself in daily prayer to God, and he had constantly followed the call of God, wherein was contained the promise of eternal life. Must they not therefore be thrice blind who see no gratuitous righteousness of God, except in the very vestibule, and think that the merit of works pervades the edifice? But it is proper to attend to the gloss by which they attempt to cloak this gross impiety, viz., that in this way they satisfy the Apostle's sentiment, "If it be of grace, then it is no more of works."

(Rom. xi. 5.) But Paul ascribes it to Divine grace that a remnant is left, and that they are miraculously preserved by God from the danger of eternal destruction, even unto the end. Far, therefore, is he from restricting it to so small a portion, *i.e.*, to the beginning alone.

It was indeed an absurd dream, but they are still more grossly absurd when they give it as their opinion, that none of all the things which precede Justification, whether faith or works, merit it. What works antecedent to Justification are they here imagining? What kind of order is this in which the fruit is antecedent in time to the root? In one word, that pious readers may understand how great progress has been made in securing purity of doctrine, the monks dunned into the ears of the reverend Fathers, whose part was to nod assent, this old song, that good works which precede justification are not meritorious of eternal salvation, but preparatory only. If any works precede faith, they should also be taken into account. But there is no merit, because there are no works; for if men inquire into their works, they will find only evil works.

Posterity will scarcely believe that the Papacy had fallen into such a stupor as to imagine the possibility of any work antecedent to justification, even though they denied it to be meritorious of so great a blessing! For what can come from man until he is born again by the Spirit of God? Very different is the reasoning of Paul. He exhorts the Ephesians to remember (chap. ii.) that they were saved by grace, not by themselves nor by their own works. He subjoins a proof, not the one which these insane Fathers use, that no works which precede suffice, but the one which I have adduced, that we are possessed of no works but those which God hath prepared, because we are his workmanship created unto a holy and pious life. Faith, moreover, precedes justification, but in such a sense, that in respect of God, it follows. What they say of faith might perhaps hold true, were faith itself, which puts us in possession of righteousness, our own. But seeing that it too is the free gift of God, the exception which they introduce is superfluous. Scripture, indeed, removes all doubt on another ground, when it opposes faith

to works, to prevent its being classed among merits. Faith brings nothing of our own to God, but receives what God spontaneously offers us. Hence it is that faith, however imperfect, nevertheless possesses a perfect righteousness, because it has respect to nothing but the gratuitous goodness of God.

In the *tenth* chapter, they inveigh against what they call The Vain Confidence of Heretics. This consists, according to their definition, in our holding it as certain that our sins are forgiven, and resting in this certainty. But if such certainty makes heretics, where will be the happiness which David extols? (Psalm xxxii.) Nay, where will be the peace of which Paul discourses in the fifth chapter to the Romans, if we rest in anything but the good-will of God? How, moreover, have we God propitious, but just because he enters not into judgment with us? They acknowledge that sins are never forgiven for Christ's sake, except freely, but leaving it in suspense to whom and when they are forgiven, they rob all consciences of calm placid confidence. Where, then, is that boldness of which Paul elsewhere speaks, (Eph. iii. 12,) that access with confidence to the Father through faith in Christ? Not contented with the term confidence, he furnishes us with boldness, which is certainly something more than certainty. And what shall we say to his own occasional use of the term certainty? (Rom. viii. 37.) This certainty he founds upon nothing but a mere persuasion of the free love of God. Nay, they overthrow all true prayer to God, when they keep pious minds suspended by fear which alone shuts the door of access against us. "He who doubts," says James, (James i. 6,) "is like a wave of the sea driven by the wind." Let not such think that they shall obtain anything of the Lord. "Let him who would pray effectually not doubt." Attend to the antithesis between faith and doubt, plainly intimating that faith is destroyed as soon as certainty is taken away.

But that the whole of their theology may be more manifest to my readers, let them weigh the words which follow under the same head. It ought not to be asserted, they say, that those who have been truly justified ought to entertain an

unhesitating doubt that they are justified. If it be so, let them teach how πληροφορία (full assurance) can be reconciled with doubt. For Paul makes it the perpetual attendant of faith. I say nothing as to their laying down as a kind of axiom what Paul regards as a monstrous absurdity. "If the inheritance is by the law," he says, (Rom. iv. 14,) "faith is made void." He argues that there will be no certainty of faith if it depends on human works—a dependence which he hesitates not to pronounce most absurd. And justly; seeing he immediately infers from it that the promise also is abolished.

I am ashamed to debate the matter, as if it were doubtful, with men who call themselves Christians. The doctrine of Scripture is clear. "We know," says John, (1 John iv. 6,) "that we are the children of God." And he afterwards explains whence this knowledge arises, viz., from the Spirit which he hath given us. In like manner Paul, too, reminds us, (1 Cor. ii. 12,) "That we have not received the spirit of the world but the Spirit which is of God, that we may know the things which are given us of God." Elsewhere it is said still more explicitly, "We have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father." (Rom. viii. 15.) Hence that access with confidence and boldness which we mentioned a little ago. And, indeed, they are ignorant of the whole nature of faith who mingle doubt with it. Were Paul in doubt, he would not exult over death, and write as he does in the eighth of the Romans, when he boasts of being so certain of the love of God that nothing can turn him from the persuasion. This is clear from his words. And he assigns the cause, "Because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit which is given to us." By this he intimates that our conscience, resting in the testimony of the Holy Spirit, boldly glories in the presence of God, in the hope of eternal life. But it is not strange that this certainty, which the Spirit of God seals on the hearts of the godly, is unknown to sophists. Our Saviour foretold that so it would be. "Not the world, but you alone in whom he abideth, will know him." (John xiv. 17.) It is not strange that

those who, having discarded the foundation of faith, lean rather on their works, should waver to and fro. For it is a most true saying of Augustine, (in Psalm lxxxviii.,) "As the promise is sure, not according to our merits, but according to his grace, no man ought to speak with trepidation of that of which he cannot doubt."

They think, however, that they ingeniously obviate all objections when they recommend a general persuasion of the grace of Christ. They prohibit any doubt as to the efficacy of Christ's death. But where do they wish it to be placed? In the air, so as to be only in confused imagination. For they allow none to apply grace to themselves with the firm assurance of faith, as if we had to no purpose received such promises as these, "Behold your king cometh;" "Ye are the heirs of promise;" "The Father is pleased in thee;" "The righteousness of God is unto all and upon all them that believe." (Matt. xxi. 5; Zech. ix. 9; Acts ii. 39; Luke xii. 32; Rom. iii. 22.) Surely, if they admit that by faith we apprehend what God offers to us, Christ is not set before me and others, merely that we may believe him to have been the Redeemer of Abraham, but that every one may appropriate the salvation which he procured. And how improper is it to assert that "no man can know with certainty of faith that he has obtained the grace of God." Paul and John recognise none as the children of God but those who know it. Of what knowledge can we understand them to speak, but that which they have learned by the teaching of the Holy Spirit? Admirably says Bernard, (Serm. v. in Dedicat. Temp.,) "Faith must here come to our aid; here truth must lend us succour; that that which lies hid in the heart of the Father respecting us may be revealed by the Spirit, or the Spirit may persuade our hearts that we are the children of God; and persuade by calling and justifying us freely by faith." But if Paul, when he exhorts the Corinthians to prove themselves whether they be in the faith, (2 Cor. xiii. 5,) pronounces all reprobate who do not know Christ dwelling in them, why should I hesitate to pronounce them twice reprobate, who, not allowing the Church to enter on any such proof, abolish all certainty concerning the grace of God?

Under the *eleventh* head, when they describe Increase of Righteousness, they not only confound the free imputation of righteousness with the merit of works, but almost exterminate it. Their words are, "Believers increase in righteousness by good works, through the observance of the commandments of God and the Church, and are thence more justified." They ought at least to use the exception of Augustine. (De Civit. xix. c. 27.) "The righteousness of believers, while they live in the world, consists more in the forgiveness of sins than the perfection of virtues." He teaches that no dependence at all is to be placed on righteousness of works, which he names with contempt. For he declares that the only hope of all the godly who groan under the weakness of the flesh is, that they have a mediator, Christ Jesus, who is the propitiation for their sins. (Lib. ad Bonif., v. c. 5.) On the contrary, the Fathers of Trent, or rather the hireling monks, who, as a kind of Latin pipers, compose for them whatever tune they please, doing their utmost to call their disciples away from the view of grace, blind them by a false confidence in works. We, indeed, willingly acknowledge, that believers ought to make daily increase in good works, and that the good works wherewith they are adorned by God, are sometimes distinguished by the name of righteousness. But since the whole value of works is derived from no other fountain than that of gratuitous acceptance, how absurd were it to make the former overthrow the latter! Why do they not remember what they learned when boys at school, that what is subordinate is not contrary? I say that it is owing to free imputation that we are considered righteous before God; I say that from this also another benefit proceeds, viz., that our works have the name of righteousness, though they are far from having the reality of righteousness. In short, I affirm, that not by our own merit but by faith alone, are both our persons and works justified; and that the justification of works depends on the justification of the person, as the effect on the cause. Therefore, it is necessary that the righteousness of faith alone so precede in order, and be so pre-eminent in degree, that nothing can go before it or obscure it.

Hence it is a most iniquitous perversion to substitute some kind of meritorious for a gratuitous righteousness, as if God after justifying us once freely in a single moment, left us to procure righteousness for ourselves by the observance of the law during the whole of life. As to the observance of the Divine Commandments, they must, whether they will or not, confess this much, that all mortals are very far from accomplishing it perfectly. Let them now answer, and say whether any part of it whatever be righteousness, or a part of righteousness? They will strenuously maintain the latter. But it is repugnant to Scripture, which gives this honour to none but perfect obedience. "The man who doeth these things shall live in them;" "Cursed is he that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them." (Gal. iii. 10.) Again, "He who fails in one point is guilty of all." (James ii. 10.) There is no man who does not acknowledge, without one word from me, that we are all subject to the curse while we keep halting at the observance of the law, and that righteousness, since works cannot procure it, must be borrowed from some other quarter. Of the commandments of the Church, which they mix up with those of God, we shall speak elsewhere. My readers, however, must be informed in passing, that no kind of impiety is here omitted. Who can excuse their profanity in not hesitating to claim a power of justifying for their own inventions? Never did even Pelagius attempt this. He attempted to fascinate miserable men by the impious persuasion that they could, by the observance of the Divine law, acquire righteousness for themselves; but to attribute this merit to human laws never entered his mind. It is execrable blasphemy against God for any mortal to give way to such presumption as to award eternal life to the observance of his own traditions.

But whither shall I turn? It is a Sacred Council that speaks, and it cannot err in the interpretation of Scripture. And they have passages of Scripture, the first out of Ecclesiasticus, "Fear not to be justified even until death." I believe there is one way of getting myself out of the difficulty. Let my readers look at the passage, and they will

find that the worthy Fathers have impudently corrupted it; for the writer says, "Be not forbidden, *i.e.*, prevented until death," although it ought rather to be rendered *defer not;* for this the Greek word means. He is inveighing against the slothfulness of those who put off their conversion to God. What was thus spoken of the commencement, these religious Fathers, not only in gross ignorance, but open malice, apply to progress. In the passage of James there is more plausibility. (James ii. 24.) But any one who has read our writings knows well enough that James gives them no support, inasmuch as he uses justification to signify, not the cause of righteousness, but the proof of it. This plainly appears from the context. But they become more ridiculous when they infer that a man is justified by good works because the Church prays for increase of faith, hope, and charity. Who, if he is not too old to be a child, is not frightened at this thunder?

Under the *twelfth* head they renew the old anathema:—Let none say that the Commandments of God are impossible to be observed by a justified man. It serves no purpose to dispute about the term *impossible.* It is enough for me, and should be enough for all who are pious, and not at all contentious, that no man ever lived who satisfied the law of God, and that none ever can be found. What! shall we accuse the Holy Spirit of falsehood, when he charges all men with the guilt of transgression, not those of our age only, but all who shall ever exist to the end of the world? "There is not a man upon earth," saith Solomon, "who sinneth not." (1 Kings viii. 46.) And David had said, "In thy sight shall no man living be justified." (Psalm cxliii. 2.) If it be possible to find any one who can fulfil the law, let the Holy Spirit retract. But far from us be the devilish pride of making the eternal Author of truth a liar. Nay, even Paul's argument would fail:—"It is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law. Therefore, whosoever are under the law are under curse." (Gal. iii. 10.) It will be easy to object, that the law can be fulfilled. But the Apostle assumes as an acknowledged principle what these men stigmatize with

anathema. Accordingly in another place, when deploring the bondage in which himself, in common with all saints, was held, he could find no other remedy than that of being freed from the body. (Rom. vii. 24.)

The Pelagians annoyed Augustine with the same quibble. He admits that God may, if he pleases, raise men to this pitch of perfection, but that he never had, and never would, because the Scriptures teach otherwise. I go farther, and assert, that what the Scriptures declare never shall be, is impossible; although, if we are to debate about a word, the very thing was expressed by Peter, (Acts xv.) when he spoke of the yoke of the law as that which none of their fathers could bear. It is an error to suppose that this refers only to ceremonies: for what so very arduous was there in ceremonies as to make all human strength fail under the burden of them? He undoubtedly means that all mankind from the beginning were, and still are, unequal to the observance of the law, and that therefore nothing remains but to flee to the grace of Christ, which, loosing us from the yoke of the law, keeps us as it were under free custody. And it is to be observed that he is speaking of the regenerate, lest the Fathers of Trent quibble, and say that he spoke of the weakness of the flesh when the assistance of the Spirit is wanting. For he affirms that prophets and patriarchs, and pious kings, however aided by the Spirit of God, were unable to bear the yoke of the law, and declares, without ambiguity, that the observance of the law was impossible.

But they also produce Scripture as a witness on the other side: for John says, that "his commandments are not grievous." (1 John v. 3.) I admit it, provided you exclude not the doctrine of the remission of sins, which he places before all the commandments. If it be not grievous to perform the law, you will find me several men without sin to make God a liar; as is said also by John. (1 John i. 8.) But these fools consider not that the facility of which John speaks depends on this, that the saints have a remedy in readiness to supply their defects—they flee for pardon. Hence, too, it is that Christ's yoke is easy and his burden light, because the saints feel an alacrity in their liberty

while they feel themselves no longer under the law. Paul applies to them this best stimulus of exhortation. (Rom. vi. 12.) And David also teaches, "With thee is forgiveness, that thou mayest be feared." (Psalm cxxx. 4.) Take that hope of pardon from me, and the least commandment of the law will be a heavier load than Ætna. But what is this to idle monks, who have here touched with the little finger that observance of the commandments of the facility of which they so confidently prattle. Nay, they openly betray their irreligion by this one dogma. How? This admirable Apostle laments that he is held captive from inability to obey the law as is meet, and he cries out that the disease cannot be cured till death cure it. (Rom. vii. 23.) These sturdy doctors superciliously smile, and sing out that such complaints are causeless, because Christ's burden is light. They afterwards add, "The disciples of Christ love him, and those who love him do his commandments." (John xiv. 23.) This is all true. But where is the perfect love of Christ—love, I mean, with the whole heart, and mind, and strength? There only where the flesh lusteth not against the spirit, and therefore not in the world at all. The disciples of Christ love him with sincere and earnest affection of heart, and according to the measure of their love keep his commandments. But how small is this compared with that strict perfection in which there is no deficiency?

Let readers of sense now attend to the consistency of the *dicta* of these Fathers. After boldly asserting that the Law can be fulfilled by believers, they admit that even the most holy sometimes fall into light and daily sins. First I ask, whether there be any sin, however light, that is not inconsistent with the observance of the law? For what vicious thought will creep into the mind of man if it be wholly occupied with the love of God? The law is not satisfied unless God is loved with the whole heart. That men do not therefore cease to be righteous I admit. But why so, but just because they are blessed to whom sin is not imputed? If they insist on being righteous by works, on which their consciences can repose in the sight of God, they, in the first place, subvert faith, and do an insufferable wrong to the

grace of God; and, in the second place, they bring no support to their impious doctrine as to possible observance of the law. If they consider what they call lighter lapses as nothing, the dreadful sentence of the Supreme Judge thunders forth, "He who shall despise one of these least commandments shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven." Although I should like to know what sins they call light, (for so they speak by way of extenuation,) and why they say that the righteous fall into them sometimes rather than constantly, or ever and anon; for scarcely a moment passes in which we do not contract some new guilt. In their eyes all kinds of concupiscence which prompt us to evil are light sins, and also all kinds of temptations which urge us to blasphemy against God. Be this as it may, they are here placed in a manifest dilemma.

What afterwards follows under the same head is no more applicable than if one were to attempt to prove from the movement of the feet that the hands do not feel. They gather some exhortations to a pious life. What, pray, will they force out of these except what may be learned a hundred times better, and with very different effect, from our writings and discourses, and even daily conversation, viz., that "we are not called to uncleanness but to holiness," that "the mercy of God hath appeared, that denying the lusts of the flesh, we may live piously and holily in the world," that "we have risen with Christ to set our affections on things above." (1 Thess. iv. 7; Tit. ii. 11; Col. iii. 12.) But they seem to think they have done some great thing when they infer that it is in vain for those who are unwilling to be partakers of the sufferings of Christ, to glory in the heavenly inheritance. How much better we explain the matter let our readers judge. There is one difference, however: we teach that we are to share in the sufferings of Christ in order that we may attain to the fellowship of his blessed resurrection; (Rom. viii. 17;) we do not separate Christ from himself. They erroneously infer what does not at all follow—that men by suffering merit eternal life, and that part of their righteousness consisting therein, they do not depend entirely on the grace of God.

But they are still more absurd in their conclusion. For they infer that all are enemies to the Christian religion who teach that the righteous sin in every good work, at least venially. I should like to know what logic taught them to draw such an inference as this: "So run that you may obtain the reward" —*ergo*, In the good works of saints there is nothing that deserves blame. Must not men be thrice stupid when such fellows can persuade them that such follies proceeded from the Holy Spirit? But, passing this absurdity, let us look at the substance.

They must of necessity admit that works are to be judged from the internal affection of mind from which they emanate, and the end at which they aim, rather than from the external mask under which they appear to men: for God looketh on the heart, as was said to Samuel, and his eyes behold the truth, as Jeremiah reminds us. It is too plain, however, that we are never animated and actuated by a perfect love to God in obeying his just commands. Various passions withdraw us from our course, so that we scarcely walk when God enjoins us to hasten on with the greatest speed; we are scarcely lukewarm when we ought to be all ardour. Though from self-deception we are not sensible of this defect, God sees and judges: in his sight the stars are dim, and the sun shineth not. In short, the seventh chapter of the Romans disposes of this controversy. There Paul, in his own person and that of all the godly, confesses that he is far from perfection, even when his will is at its best. Wherefore let a man flatter himself as he may, the best work that ever was, if brought by God to judgment, will be found stained by some blemish. But these works are approved by God. Who denies it? We only maintain that they cannot please without pardon. But what is it that God pardons except sin? Hence it follows that there is nothing so very censurable in saying, that all good works whatever, if judged with strict rigour, are more deserving of eternal damnation than of the reward of life; for wherever sin, in however slight a degree, is found, no man of sound judgment will deny that there too the materials of death are found. Owing, however, to the boundless mercy of God, works have a re-

compense in heaven, though they not only merited nothing of the kind, but would have the reward of eternal death were not the impurity with which they are otherwise defiled wiped away by Christ. I have moreover shewn in many places how absurd the reasoning is which infers dignity or merit from the use of the term *reward.* The reason is obvious. The very recompense which the sophists assert to be founded on merit, depends on gratuitous acceptance.

Under the *thirteenth* head, if they only did what the title professes, I would give them my subscription. But since, while professing to obviate rashness and presumption, they make it their whole study to efface from the minds of the pious all confidence in their election, I am forced to oppose them, because they are plainly opposed by Scripture. For to what end does Paul discourse at such length in the first chapter to the Ephesians, on the eternal election of God, unless to persuade them that they were chosen by it unto eternal life? And there is no need of conjecture; for he repeatedly enjoins the Ephesians to hold it fixed in their minds, that they have been called and made partakers of the gospel, because they were elected in Christ before the foundation of the world. Likewise in the eighth chapter to the Romans, he expressly conjoins the doctrine of election with the assurance of faith.

I acknowledge, indeed, and we are all careful to teach, that nothing is more pernicious than to inquire into the secret council of God, with the view of thereby obtaining a knowledge of our election—that this is a whirlpool in which we shall be swallowed up and lost. But seeing that our Heavenly Father holds forth in Christ a mirror of our eternal adoption, no man truly holds what has been given us by Christ save he who feels assured that Christ himself has been given him by the Father, that he may not perish. What! are the following passages mere verbiage? "The Father who has placed us under the protection and faith of his Son is greater than all." "The Son will not allow anything to be lost." (John vi. 39; x. 28.) These things are said that all who are the sons of God may trust in such a guardian of their salvation, and feel safe in the midst of

danger; nay, when beset with infinite perils, may trust that their salvation is secure because in the hand of God.

But they affirm, that it is impossible to know whom God has chosen except by special revelation. I admit it. And, accordingly, Paul says that we have not received the spirit of this world, but the Spirit which is of God, that we may know the things which are given us of God. The gift he elsewhere interprets as meaning the adoption, by which we are classed among his children, and which he holds to be so certain that we may with loud voice glory in it. But I am not unaware of what they intend by special revelation. I, however, mean that which our Heavenly Father specially deigns to bestow on his own children. Nor is this any fancy of my own. The words of Paul are well known, "Those things which are hidden from human sense God hath revealed unto us by his Spirit, who also searcheth the deepest things of God." Again, "Who hath known the mind of God, or who hath been his counsellor? But we have the mind of Christ."

On the whole, then, we see that what the venerable Fathers call rash and damnable presumption, is nothing but that holy confidence in our adoption revealed unto us by Christ, to which God everywhere encourages his people.

Under the *fourteenth* head they prohibit any one from feeling absolutely certain that God will bestow upon him the gift of Final Perseverance, and yet they do not disapprove of entertaining the strongest hope of it in God. But let them first shew us by what kind of cement they can glue together things so opposed to each other as the strongest hope and a doubtful expectation. For certainly, he whose expectation of eternal life is not founded on absolute certainty, must be agitated by various doubts. This is not the kind of hope which Paul describes, when he says that he is certainly persuaded that neither life nor death, nor things present, nor things to come, will dissolve the love with which God embraces him in Christ. He would not speak thus did not the certainty of Christian hope reach beyond the last hour of life. And what language do the promises speak? The Spirit not only declares that the just lives by faith, but

that he shall live. (Hab. ii. 4.) Thus far must hope reach. Paul even shews this when he describes hope as patiently waiting for things which are yet concealed.

But, it may be said, they do not take away hope, but only absolute certainty. What! is there any expression of doubt or uncertainty when Paul boldly asserts that a crown of righteousness is laid up for him? (1 Tim. iv. 8.) Is there anything conditional in the words, when he declares that an earnest of our adoption has been given us, so that we can dare with loud voice to call God our Father? They take refuge in the frivolous quibble out of which I have already driven them, viz., that Paul had this by special revelation. But he claims nothing so special for himself as not to share it with all believers, when in their name as much as his own, he boldly exults over death and life, the present and the future. Nor does John claim for himself alone that knowledge in which he glories, when he says, "We know that we shall be like God, for we shall see him as he is." (1 John iii. 2.) Nor Paul, when he says, "We glory in hope of the glory of God;" and again, "We know that when this earthly tabernacle falls, a mansion is prepared for us in heaven." (Rom. v. 2; 2 Cor. v. 1.)

They make a gloss of what is said in the tenth chapter of First Corinthians, "Let him who standeth take heed lest he fall." Of this there is a twofold solution. Paul there only checks carnal arrogance, which has nothing to do with the assurance of hope; nor does he address believers only, but all of the Gentiles who had assumed the name of Christ, among whom there might be many puffed up with vain confidence. For the comparison which is there made between Jews and Gentiles, is not confined to the elect only, but comprehends all who belonged to the Church by name. I will be satisfied, however, with this one reply, as it is quite sufficient, viz., that the fear enjoined is not that which in the smallest degree impairs the certainty of faith or hope, but only that which keeps us solicitous in the fear of God.

The regenerate are not yet in glory, but only in the hope of glory, and much of the contest still remains. Hence did they infer that torpor must be shaken off, and no overweening

security indulged, there is no man of sense who would not subscribe to them. But when they employ the passage as a battering-ram to shake the firmness of our hope, and drive us headlong, their conduct is on no account to be tolerated. In qualifying Paul's sentiment, and making it mean that the work of salvation which God has begun will be perfected in us only if we are not wanting to his grace, they act very ignorantly, not observing that one part of grace consists in having God present with us so as to prevent our being wanting to his grace. This doctrine ought not to give occasion to sloth; it ought only to make them recognise what they have received of God, and what they expect from him.

I could like, if I durst, to pass many things without affixing a stigma to them. But what can I do? There is scarcely one line which does not contain some notable error or give indications of dishonest dealing. On the *fifteenth* head, where they treat of recovery after the fall, they say that Jerome gave an appropriate definition of repentance, when he called it the second plank after shipwreck. Were I disposed to criticise the *dictum* of Jerome, I would ask why he calls it the second plank, and not the third or fourth? for how few are there who do not during life make more than one shipwreck. Nay, what man was ever found whom the grace of God has not rescued from daily shipwrecks? But I have no business with Jerome at present.

The Fathers of Trent do not treat of Repentance, but of the Sacrament of Penitence, which they pretend to have been instituted by Christ. When? When he said, Receive ye the Holy Spirit; whose sins ye remit, they shall be remitted. (John xx. 22.) First, because Christ gave the Apostles this authority, is it therefore a sacrament? Where is the sign? where the form? Secondly, who knows not that this office was assigned to the Apostles that they might perform it towards strangers? How asinine the Fathers must be to allow the absurd trifling of a dreaming monk thus to pass without opposition! Christ confirms the testimony which the Apostles were to bear to the world concerning the remission of sins. Such is the message which is conveyed by the gospel, and that, too, to those who are not yet chosen into

the Church. Some babbler among the monks who rule the Council having never perhaps looked at the passage, certainly never pondered it, read out his own commentary that there a formula is prescribed by which those who had fallen after baptism were to be restored to a state of grace. The stupid Fathers nodded assent. The passage itself, however, proclaims that it was shamelessly wrested. They infer that the penitence of a Christian man after a lapse, is very different from baptismal penitence: as if Christ had only referred to one species, and not expressly required, as the twenty-fourth chapter of Luke informs us, that repentance as well as remission of sins should be preached in his name.

They go farther, and say, that this Penitence with which they trifle consists not only in contrition of heart, but the confession of the mouth and the satisfaction of works: although not to appear unmerciful, they mitigate the rigour of their law when they allow themselves to be appeased by a wish to confess. Why should I begin a long discussion here? The point is the remission of sins: which is the knowledge of salvation. (Luke i. 77.) God promises it to us free in the blood of Christ: of auricular confession he says not a word. These new lawgivers tie down forgiveness to a formula of confession, contrary to the command of God, and assert that it is redeemed by satisfaction. What will remain for miserable consciences, if they are forced to abandon the word of God and acquiesce in the decrees of men?

I am desirous to be assured of my salvation. I am shewn in the word of God a simple way, which will lead me straight to the entire and tranquil possession of this great boon. I will say no more. Men come and lay hands on me, and tie me down to a necessity of confession from which Christ frees me. They lay upon me the burden of satisfaction, ordering me to provide at my own hand that which Christ shews me is to be sought from his blood alone. Can I long doubt what it is expedient to do? Nay, away with all hesitation, when attempts are made to lead us away from the only author of our salvation. Search as they may, not a syllable will be found by which Christ orders us to confess our sins into a human ear. All the promises relating to the remission

of sins make not the smallest mention of such a thing. The law was wholly unknown to the Apostles. Throughout the Eastern Church it was scarcely ever used. Nay, the observance was everywhere free for more than a thousand years, till Innocent III., with a few of his horned crew, entangled the Christian people in this net, which the Fathers of Trent would now make fast. What I say is abundantly testified by ancient history. Our books are filled with proofs. None of them are unknown to those who dictated this famous formula to the Council; and yet so impudent are they, that they would persuade us by one word that the door of salvation is closed, and can only be opened by the key of a fictitious confession. But who will grant them a license to restrict the promises of Christ, by imposing any condition they please?

I do not say at present how cruel an executioner to torture and excruciate consciences is that law of Innocent which they anew promulgate; how many it has driven headlong to despair; what a narcotic of hypocrisy it has been to lull others asleep; how many monstrous iniquities have sprung from it! Nay, let us even imagine, as they themselves falsely give out, that some advantage flows from it: it is nothing to the purpose. The question is asked, How are those who have fallen from divine grace restored to it? Scripture everywhere shews the method, but makes no reference to confession, which was long afterwards coined in human brains. What effrontery! to preclude access to the hope of obtaining pardon, unless the confession which they have been pleased to prescribe precedes. The question relates to repentance. Its whole force and nature are so frequently, so copiously, so clearly depicted by the Holy Spirit in the law, the Prophets, and the Gospel, that no doctrine is more lucidly explained. Of confession, such as they pretend, there is throughout a profound silence. Who, then, will believe them when they affirm that no repentance is genuine without that appendage, nay, unless it be included in it?

It is enough for me to know the two following things—first, that they devise a Repentance altogether different from

that which is recommended to us in Scripture; and secondly, that they enact a condition for obtaining the remission of sins, from which he, to whom alone the power of remitting belongs, wished us to be free. The latter is just as if they were forbidding God to promise salvation without their permission, or at least were opposing his performance of the promise of salvation which he has given. For they do not permit him to pardon our sins, unless it be on the condition of our performing an observance which they alone make binding.

With regard to Satisfaction, they think they make a subtle distinction when they collect the dregs of the vile comments of the sophists,—that not eternal punishment, indeed, but temporal, is to be compensated by satisfaction. Who knew not that such was the prattle of the sophists? And yet, when they pretend that eternal punishment, together with guilt, is remitted to us by confession, or the wish to confess, what else do they mean than that we merit by works what God promises to give freely?

But let us now see the force of the distinction. When the Prophets mention the gratuitous remission of sins, it is true they usually refer to its other effect, viz., that God would be appeased, and no longer avenge the sins of his people or visit them with his rod. Whoever is moderately versed in Scripture will acknowledge the strict accuracy of my statement, that the punishments which we deserved are mitigated, loosed, in fine, abolished, because God pardons us, not for any merit of our own, as if he were appeased by compensation, but because he is moved solely by his own mercy. The Babylonish captivity was a temporal punishment. Its termination in seventy years, when the Israelites deserved it much longer, God ascribes to his own free mercy. Whenever the chastisements which God had threatened are withdrawn, it is uniformly represented as the result of gratuitous reconciliation. It is certainly a relaxation of temporal punishment which God promises in these words, "Not on your account will I do it, but for my name's sake." And Isaiah, when he states, that the satisfaction or price of our peace was laid upon Christ, reminds us that we have not

only been freed from punishment by his interposition, but that he bore on our account all the pains by which God is wont to avenge or chastise our sins, in order that we may, however unworthy, enjoy all the blessings of the present life also. (Isaiah xlviii. 9; liii. 5.) But God nevertheless still chastises believers. I admit it. But to what end? Is it that he, by inflicting punishment, may pay what is due to himself and his own justice? Not at all; but that he may humble them, by striking them with a dread of his anger, that he may produce in them an earnest feeling of repentance, and render them more cautious in future. But there are means by which they may avert these punishments; I mean, when they anticipate them of their own accord, there is no reason why God should as it were drag them violently. When is there occasion for the rod but just when voluntary correction is wanting? Accordingly, the Apostle tells us that those who shall have judged themselves shall not be judged by the Lord. (1 Cor. xi. 31.)

But how preposterous to infer satisfaction from this? The greater part of believers have, by prayer, warded off the chastisement to which they had made themselves liable. Nay, even Ahab, when he humbles himself spontaneously, feels the hand of God fall lighter upon him. (1 Kings xxi. 29.) The deprecatory petitions which the saints employed are the most decisive witnesses to gratuitous satisfaction. But these Fathers, it seems, adduce nothing which they cannot prove by passages of Scripture; for Paul teaches, that the sorrow which is agreeable to God worketh repentance unto salvation not to be repented of. (2 Cor. vii. 10.) What! does Paul here call us back to satisfaction? I hear no word of it. They are dishonestly deluding us. They do so still more in what follows, when they tell us that John must be understood to refer to the same penitence in saying, "Repent, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance." (Luke iii. 8.) But whom did John address in these terms? Was it not persons who offered themselves for baptism while not yet imbued with the faith of Christ? Somewhat different from this, and yet not less absurd, is their quotation from the second chapter of the Revelations, "Re-

member whence thou art fallen, and first do works;" whereas the proper reading is, "*do the first works*," or the former works. The writer exhorts the Ephesians to return to their former state of life. With what face is this stretched to satisfaction? When they so pertly called black white, did they think there would be no eyes to detect their fraud? Lysander once said to deputies who had spoken in a meeting of allies more imperiously than they ought, that they had need of a city which would be very indulgent to them. These masters would need a herd of oxen if they wish to have an audience which they can persuade to believe what they please. Let them go and boast of being guided immediately by the Holy Spirit, while they are palpable falsifiers of holy writ.

To sum up the whole—Though believers ought to be constantly thinking of Repentance, these Holy Fathers imagine it to be an indescribable something of rare occurrence—though Scripture declares repentance to be a renewal of the whole man—though it points out its very source, fear excited by a true sense of the Divine judgment—though it enumerates its parts, self-denial, which consists in a hatred of sin and dissatisfaction with our own depravity, and renewal of life or regeneration of the spirit, which is nothing else than the restoration of the Divine image—though it carefully marks its effects, and explicitly defines its whole nature,—the venerable Fathers produce nothing but the flimsy inanities by which the doctrine of repentance has been corrupted under the Papacy. What was said by ecclesiastical writers concerning external discipline, which referred to the formal profession of repentance, they ignorantly wrest to the spiritual renovation which formed the subject of their discourse. Not to be tedious in reviewing each point, let any one compare their lucubrations with our writings, and he will find and acknowledge that they have turned light into darkness.

I have hitherto endeavoured to censure without accusing; and impartial readers will observe, that I censure nothing unless compelled to do so. But there is not a sentence which does not extort more of it from me than I could wish. Of this nature is the assertion under the *sixteenth* head,

that the grace of Justification is lost, not only by unbelief, but by any mortal sin. If they meant that we are ejected from the possession (enjoyment) of this great blessing by an evil conscience, I would not at all gainsay them, I mean as far as regards ourselves. For although God does not cast us off, yet an evil conscience is such a separation from him as excludes us from the enjoyment of a lively and justifying knowledge of his paternal love towards us. But they are preposterous, *first*, in recognising no sin as mortal that is not gross and palpable, whereas most inward sins wound the mind more grievously and even fatally; and, *secondly*, in not perceiving how a good conscience is the inseparable attendant of faith. Were it not so, how could it be said that our hearts are purified by faith, that Christ dwells in our hearts by faith, that it is the victory by which we overcome the world, the shield for repelling the assaults of the devil, and that we are kept by faith through the power of God unto salvation? (Acts xv. 9; Eph. iii. 17; 1 John v. 4; Eph. vi. 16; 1 Peter v. 9; i. 5.) There is no doubt, therefore, that faith is overwhelmed and buried in a man whenever he has been overcome by any temptation so as to abandon the fear of God. For the Spirit of holiness cannot be separated from faith any more than can Christ himself. I do not assert, however, that when we forsake the fear of the Lord faith is altogether extinguished in us. But as the fear of God is oppressed by depraved lusts, so I say that faith is stifled, and for the time exerts its power no more than if it were in a manner dead. The holy Fathers craftily endeavour to burrow out a hole in which they may hide their impious dogma, that we are not justified by faith alone. Not succeeding in this they attempt another method.

We come now to the *last* head, which treats of The Merit of Works. Here there is no dispute between us as to the necessity of exhorting believers to good works, and even stimulating them by holding forth a reward. What then? First, I differ from them in this, that they make eternal life the reward; for if God rewards works with eternal life, they will immediately make out that faith itself is the reward which is paid, whereas Scripture uniformly proclaims that

it is the inheritance which falls to us by no other right than that of free adoption. But there is still greater ground for contradicting, when they are not ashamed to affirm that nothing is to prevent believers from satisfying the Law, at least in a degree proportioned to the present state, and meriting eternal life. Where then will be the blessedness of which David speaks, (Psalm xxxii.,) and without which we are all thrice wretched? Wo to those miserable men who perceive not that he who has come nearest to perfection has not yet advanced half-way! All who have their conscience exercised feel the strict truth of Augustine's sentiment, "The righteousness of saints in this life consists more in the forgiveness of sins than the perfection of virtues." (Lib. de Civit. Dei, xix. c. 27.) Still more accurate is another passage which I quoted, that, "so long as they groan under the infirmity of the flesh, the only hope left them is, that they have a mediator in Christ by whom they are reconciled to God." (Lib. ad Bon., iii. c. 5.)

It is not strange, however, that addle-pated monks who, having never experienced any struggle of conscience, and who, moreover, being intoxicated with ambition, or surfeiting and drunkenness, only desire to raise themselves in the estimation of their idol, should thus prate of the perfection of the Law. With the same confidence do they talk of a heaven for hire, while they themselves meanwhile continue engrossed with the present hire, after which they are always gaping. But in vain do they attempt to dazzle eyes not wholly blind with those fair colours which they afterwards employ when they prohibit any one from glorying or confiding in works, because they are the gifts of God. Not to mention that what they now confess to be gifts of God, they previously claimed in a greater degree for human ability, there are three errors in their decree which are not to be tolerated. Though they mention incidentally that the good works of the pious are meritorious by the merit of Christ, they omit the most necessary part, viz., that there is no work untainted with impurity, until it be washed away by the blood of Christ. Nay rather, they annex a false dignity to works, as if they could please without pardon. There is,

indeed, a speciousness in the gloss that they all flow from the Spirit of Christ. But where will the absolute power of the Holy Spirit be found? Is it not distributed to every one in measure? (1 Cor. xii. 11.) They ought, therefore, to have observed, that it is always mixed with dross of ours which taints its purity. But while our inherent depravity renders every kind of work which proceeds from us vicious in the sight of God, the only thing left for our works is to recover the grace which they have not in themselves, by a gratuitous acceptance. This is done when works acknowledged to have no value in themselves borrow, and, as it were, beg their value from Christ.

It is, indeed, a gross and impious delusion, not to acknowledge that every work which proceeds from us has only one way of obtaining acceptance, viz., when all that was vicious in it is pardoned by paternal indulgence. Another delusion almost similar to this is their not reflecting, that even if we should have merited anything by any one work, the whole of the merit, be it what it may, is lost by contrary transgression. "He who offends in one point is guilty of all." (James ii. 10.) What reward do you promise yourself when nothing is produced but liability to eternal death? They are also in error when they do not flee to the only remedy, and assuming that there is some good thing in them, ask God of his goodness to regard it with favour, by not imputing the evil things which far exceed it both in weight and number.

The third error, however, is by far the worst, I mean their making assurance of salvation depend on the view of works. At one time, indeed, they prohibit us from trusting in ourselves, but when they again tell us to look to our works that we may have a sure hope of salvation, what grounds of hope can we find in them? Do they not plainly place our whole trust in ourselves? Accordingly, they add a clause which is fit only for such a doctrine. It is, that in this life we carry on a warfare of doubtful issue, and cannot attain certainty, until God render to every one according to his works. By this they overthrow all confidence in our faith, or to use Paul's expression, make faith itself void. (Rom. iv. 14.)

But Paul declares that he is not justified, because he is not conscious of anything in himself. (1 Cor. iv. 4.) This is true, and therefore, in order that our possession of righteousness may be stable and tranquil, our part is to omit all mention of works, and beseech our Judge not to enter into judgment with us. (Psalm cxliii. 2.) We reach the haven of security only when God lays aside the character of Judge, and exhibits himself to us as a Father.

And yet those swinish men are not ashamed to thunder out a cruel denunciation to terrify the simple, that no man is capable of receiving righteousness who does not firmly adhere to whatever they prescribe. What! has a new method of Justification lately appeared? Or rather, as salvation is one, do we not all come to it by one way? What will become of the Prophets and Apostles who gave no heed to such masters? Therefore, paying no regard to the Council of Trent, let us hold that fixed faith which the Prophets and Apostles, by the Spirit of Christ, delivered to us, knowing whence we have learned it. But the venerable Fathers, as if to make it impossible for any man to doubt that they are of the number of those whose mouth, as David exclaims, (Psalm iv. 7,) is full of cursing and bitterness, proceed, with truculent bluster, to send forth almost as many anathemas as there are individuals among them, and give these the plausible and honourable name of Canons! Yet that I may not seem to act maliciously, as if I had forgotten the moderation I have hitherto observed, I willingly subscribe to the three first. To the rest I will affix brief censures.

Antidote to the Canons of the Council of Trent.

To Canons I., II., and III., I say, AMEN.

CANON IV.

This was answered above, when I explained how Free-will assents to God calling and exciting it. We certainly obey

God with our will, but it is with a will which he has formed in us. Those, therefore, who ascribe any proper movement to free-will, apart from the grace of God, do nothing else than rend the Holy Spirit. Paul declares, not that a faculty of willing is given to us, but that the will itself is formed in us, (Phil. ii. 13,) so that from none else but God is the assent or obedience of a right will. He acts within, holds our hearts, moves our hearts, and draws us by the inclinations which he has produced in us. So says Augustine. (Lib. de Corrupt. et Grat., c. 14.) What preparation can there be in a heart of iron, until by a wondrous change it begins to be a heart of flesh? This, as the Prophet declares, is entirely the work of God. The will of man will, indeed, dissent from God, so long as it continues contrary, but when it has been framed for obedience, the danger of dissenting is removed. But that the efficacy of divine grace is such, that all opposition is beaten down, and we who were unwilling are made obedient, it is not we who assent, but the Lord by the Prophet, when he promises that he will make us to walk in his precepts; and Christ also, when he says, "Whosoever hath heard of my Father cometh unto me." (John vi. 45.)

Canon V.

Let us not raise a quarrel about a word. But as by Free-will they understand a faculty of choice perfectly free and unbiassed to either side, those who affirm that this is merely to use a name without a substance, have the authority of Christ when he says, that they are free whom the Son makes free, and that all others are the slaves of sin. Freedom and slavery are certainly contrary to each other. As to the term itself, let them hear Augustine, who maintains that the human will is not free so long as it is subject to passions which vanquish and enthral it. (Epist. 144, ad Anastas.) Elsewhere he says, "The will being vanquished by the depravity into which it has fallen, nature is without freedom." (Hom. 3, in Joann.) Again, "Man making a bad use of free-will lost both himself and it." Again, "Man received great powers of free-will when he was created, but lost them by sinning. Foolish men consider not that in the term free-

will freedom is implied. But if they are the slaves of sin, why do they boast of free-will? For of whom a man is overcome, to the same is he bound a slave." Nay, in another place he openly derides the name. "The will," says he, "is free, not freed—free to righteousness, the slave of sin! Why, then, do they so much inflame miserable men by reminding them of their slavery, but just that they might learn to flee to the deliverer?" (Aug. de Perfect. Justit. Lib. de Verb. Apost. Serm. 3; De Spiritu et Litera, c. 30; De Corrupt. et Grat., c. 13.)

Canon VI.

As I abhor paradox, I readily repudiate the saying that the treachery of Judas is as properly the work of God as the calling of Paul. But they never will convince any man that God only acts permissively in the wicked, except it be one who is ignorant of the whole doctrine of Scripture. When it is said that the reprobate are set apart to execute the work of God; that his are the snares, swords, and axes which are directed by his hand; that his hiss arouses them to execute what his hand and counsel have decreed; that Christ was slain by the Jews by the determinate counsel of God, (Isaiah x. 5; Ezek. xvii. 20; xxxii. 2; Psalm xvii. 13; Acts ii. 4, 23,) the words are too strong to be evaded by the subterfuge of permission. Augustine interprets better. After quoting the passages of Scripture in which the Father is said to have delivered up the Son, and Christ to have delivered himself, he immediately adds, "What, then, did Judas do but sin?" Nor can he be justly blamed for saying elsewhere, that "God worketh in the hearts of men to incline their wills as he pleaseth, whether to good, of his mercy, or to evil, according to their deservings, and that by his judgment, sometimes open, sometimes hidden, but always just;" for he immediately adds the qualification, that "the malice is not his." (De Verb. Dom. Serm. 63.) In like manner he had said a little before, "He does not command the wicked by ordering, in which case obedience would be laudable, but by his secret and just judgment he bends their will, already bad by their own depravity, to this misdeed or that." (Aug. de

Gr. et Lib. Arb. c. 21.) For there is nothing here but what the Scriptures teach almost in the same words when they speak of *inclining* and *turning, hardening* and *doing.*

Canon VII.

Assuredly a bad tree can only produce bad fruit. But who will be so shameless as to deny that we are bad trees until we are ingrafted into Christ? Therefore, if any good fruit is praised in man, let the root of it be sought in faith, as Augustine admonishes, (in Psalm xxxi. Serm. 1.) There God so often declares that he regards not the outward appearance, but looketh on the heart. This is said expressly by Jeremiah. (Jer. v.) But what can be the cleanness or sincerity of a heart which Peter tells us is purified only by faith? (Acts xv. 9.) Admirably, therefore, does Augustine say to Boniface, "Our religion distinguishes the just from the unjust, not by the law of works, but by the law of faith, without which the works which seem good turn to sin." He adds, "Therefore unbelievers sin in whatever they do, because they do not refer their doings to a lawful end." (Lit. ad Bonif., Lib. 3, c. 5.) He treats copiously of the same subject in his tract against Julian. Hence, also, in another place he describes theirs as a wandering course, inasmuch as the more active they are, the farther they are carried from the goal, and the more therefore their condition becomes hopeless. At last he concludes, that "it is better to limp in the course than keep running out of it." (Praef. in Psalm xxxi.) And what more would we have? Let them anathematize the Apostle, who declares that without faith it is impossible to please God! (Heb. xi. 6.) Let them anathematize Christ and Paul, who declare that all unbelievers are dead, and are raised from death by the gospel! (John v.; Eph. ii. 1.)

Canon VIII.

I answer: Amen. Nor do I think that the thing ever came into any man's mind. For being such as is described by them, it comprehends true repentance and is conjoined with faith. On the subject of the servile fear of hell, which

to some degree restrains unbelievers from rushing with such furious and headlong impetus into wicked courses, we are of the same sentiments as Augustine, whose words are, (Ad. Anast. Ep. 144,) "What man is found innocent before God, who, if fear were withdrawn, would do what God forbids? He is guilty in his will by wishing to do what cannot lawfully be done. As far as he is concerned, he would rather that there was no justice prohibiting and punishing sin. And hence, if he would rather that there was no justice, who can doubt that he would take it away if he could? How then is he righteous who is such an enemy to righteousness, that if power were given him he would take it away when commanding, and not bear it when threatening or judging? He, therefore, is the enemy of righteousness who does not sin, because he is afraid of punishment. And, indeed, when all the progress made is that the sinner curbed by terror murmurs against God, who can deny that by such contumacy he aggravates his sin?"

Canon IX.

This Canon is very far from being canonical; for it joins things which are utterly at variance. They imagine that a man is justified by faith without any movement of his own will, as if it were not with the heart that a man believeth unto righteousness. Between them and us there is this difference, that they persuade themselves that the movement comes from the man himself, whereas we maintain that faith is voluntary, because God draws our wills to himself. Add, that when we say a man is justified by faith alone, we do not fancy a faith devoid of charity, but we mean that faith alone is the cause of justification.

Canon X.

Could these anathemas take effect, all who are not versed in the sophistical art would pay dearly for their simplicity. They formerly asserted in their decrees that the righteousness of God was the only formal cause of Justification; now they anathematize those who say that we are formally righteous by the obedience of Christ. But it is in another sense.

I see it or scent it. But how few are there who will not be misled by the ambiguity? Although it may be that having met with the sentiment somewhere and not understood it, they boldly condemn it. For as it were impious to say that the righteousness of Christ is only an exemplar or type to us, so if any one were to teach that we are righteous formally, *i.e.*, not by quality but by imputation, meaning that our righteousness is in relation merely, there would be nothing worthy of censure. The adverb *formally* is used in both senses.

Canon XI.

I wish the reader to understand that as often as we mention Faith alone in this question, we are not thinking of a dead faith, which worketh not by love, but holding faith to be the only cause of justification. (Gal. v. 6; Rom. iii. 22.) It is therefore faith alone which justifies, and yet the faith which justifies is not alone: just as it is the heat alone of the sun which warms the earth, and yet in the sun it is not alone, because it is constantly conjoined with light. Wherefore we do not separate the whole grace of regeneration from faith, but claim the power and faculty of justifying entirely for faith, as we ought. And yet it is not us that these Tridentine Fathers anathematize so much as Paul, to whom we owe the definition that the righteousness of man consists in the forgiveness of sins. The words are in the fourth chapter to the Romans, "David speaketh of the blessedness of the man to whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are those whose iniquities are forgiven." (Psalm xxxii. 1.) We see that in Paul's view blessedness and righteousness mean the same thing. And where does he place both but solely in the remission of sins? His meaning is the same as in the fifth chapter of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing unto men their trespasses." For he immediately explains how that reconciliation comes to us: "We are ambassadors beseeching you as in the name of Christ. He made him who knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might be the righteousness of God in him." See how being reconciled to God by the sacrifice of

Christ, we both are accounted and are righteous in him. But why quote one passage after another, while this is the doctrine uniformly inculcated by Prophets and Apostles?

It is worth while to observe how dexterously they accommodate Scripture to their purpose. They say that the love which is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit must not be excluded. Thus they corrupt one passage by another. The context shews that Paul does not there speak of our own love, but of the paternal love of God toward us; for he holds it forth as ground of consolation in all circumstances of adversity, that the Spirit suggests proof of the divine benevolence towards us. This swinish herd, on the contrary, twist it to mean, that we are not ashamed of hoping because we love God. And the moment they have given utterance to the words they insist on being regarded as oracles! With similar perversion they make justifying grace a habit, and deny that it proceeds from the free favour of God. The words of Scripture are clear as day against them. For when Paul says, that to believers reward is imputed not as of debt but of grace; and again, that the inheritance is of faith that it may be of grace, (Rom. iv. 4,) how is it possible in expounding it to give it any other meaning than that of free favour? What else is meant by a purpose of grace? One of the most striking passages is the first chapter to the Ephesians, where, going on word by word, he tells us that the Father hath made us acceptable to himself in the Son.

Canon XII.

The venerable Fathers will not allow Justifying Faith to be defined as the confidence with which we embrace the mercy of God as forgiving sin for Christ's sake. But it pleases the Holy Spirit, who thus speaks by the mouth of Paul, "We are justified freely by the grace of God, through the redemption which is in Christ, whom God hath appointed a propitiation through faith in his blood for the remission of sins which are past." (Rom. iii. 24.) Nor is it possible to give a different exposition to what he afterwards says, viz., that "being justified by faith we have peace with God." (Rom. v. 1.) How so, but just that our consciences are never at

ease until they rest in the mercy of God? This he distinctly expresses immediately after, when he adds the reason, that the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, as being the witness of our free adoption, and not the witness only, but also the earnest and seal. Again, "We have boldness and access with confidence through faith in him." For the same reason he calls the gospel, rather than the law, "the doctrine of faith." He moreover declares, that the gospel is "the message of reconciliation."

CANON XIII.

That, however, is Paul's meaning when he concludes, that if Faith is made void the promise is abolished. (Rom. iv. 14.) That too is the meaning of the term πληροφορία, which Paul also sometimes uses. Accordingly he regards the eyes of our mind as not duly enlightened unless we perceive what is the hope of our inheritance. It is also sufficiently obvious from the above passages, that faith is not right unless we dare with tranquil minds to sist ourselves into the divine presence. For, as Bernard admirably expresses it, (Super Cantic. Serm. xvi. c. 3, 10,) "If conscience is troubled, it will not be troubled out of measure, because it will remember the words of our Lord. Therein the infirm have firm rest and security." To the same effect are the words of Zechariah, "Each one will come to his own vine, and dwell safely under his own fig-tree, when the iniquity of the land shall have been forgiven."

CANON XIV.

I see not why they should condemn the same thing twice, unless it be they were afraid that their first thunderbolt had fallen scatheless! But though they should fulminate a hundred times they will not be able to prevail in the least degree against this clear truth of God. Christ says, "Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee." This sentence the horned Fathers abominate, whenever any one teaches that acquittal is completed by faith alone. And yet the pious reader ought to remember that we do not exclude repentance, which is altogether necessary, but mention faith

only when the inquiry relates to the cause of acquittal. And justly do we so. For how can any one begin truly to fear God unless he is persuaded that God is propitious to him? And whence this persuasion but from confidence in acquittal?

Canon XV.

It is indeed true that to pry too minutely into this matter is hurtful, and therefore to be avoided; but that knowledge of Predestination which Paul recommends dreads neither the stern trident of Neptune, nor all the blasts of Æolus, nor the thunders of the Cyclops, nor any violence of tempests. For he wishes the Ephesians to know and be assured that they have been made partakers of heavenly grace in Christ, as they had been chosen in him before the foundation of the world. (Eph. i. 4.) Thus therefore it becomes all believers to be assured of their election, that they may learn to behold it in Christ as in a mirror. Nor is it to no purpose that Christ animates his followers by this consoling reflection—that not one of those whom the Father hath given him shall perish. (John vi. 39.) What else, good Sirs, is a certain knowledge of our Predestination than that testimony of adoption which Scripture makes common to all the godly?

Canon XVI.

That I may not be forced often to repeat the same thing, what they here condemn is nothing else than what I have previously shewn to have been delivered by the same oracles of the Holy Spirit.

Canon XVII.

The words of Luke are, "All who had been pre-ordained to life believed." (Acts xiii. 48.) He intimates whence it was that in one audience such a difference existed that some believed, and others persisted in their obstinacy. In like manner Paul asserts, that those are called whom God has previously chosen. (Rom. viii. 29.) Are not also the reprobate called? Not effectually. For there is this difference in the calling of God, that he invites all indiscriminately by his word, whereas he inwardly calls the elect alone, as Christ

says, "All that the Father hath given me will come to me." (John vi. 37.) In short, if any man is ignorant that the Spirit of regeneration is given to none but the regenerate, I know not what part of Scripture he holds.

Canon XVIII.

Were Regeneration perfected in this life the observance of the law would be possible. But seeing that believers as long as they live here only perceive the goal at a distance, and with much difficulty keep panting towards it, where is the perfection of obedience, of which those men dream, to be found? But there is no wonder that they prate so boldly of things they know not. War is pleasant to those who never tried it.

Canon XIX.

Amen.

Canon XX.

While no sane man will strike off the yoke of God from the shoulders of believers, as if they behoved not to keep his Commandments, it must still be understood that assurance of salvation by no means depends on the observance of them. For the words of Paul always hold true, that the difference between the Law and the Gospel lies in this, that the latter does not like the former promise life under the condition of works, but from faith. What can be clearer than the antithesis—"The righteousness of the law is in this wise, The man who doeth these things shall live in them. But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh thus, Whoso believeth," &c. (Rom. x. 5.) To the same effect is this other passage, "If the inheritance were of the law, faith would be made void and the promise abolished. Therefore it is of faith that in respect of grace the promise might be sure to every one that believeth." (Rom. iv. 14.) As to ecclesiastical laws, they must themselves see to them: we acknowledge one Legislator, to whom it belongs to deliver the rule of life, as from him we have life.

CANON XXI.

No one says so. The Fathers, therefore, are anathematizing their own figments, unless perhaps they are offended because we deny that Christ as a lawgiver delivered new laws to the world. That he did so they imagined foolishly. Neither did Moses testify in vain that the Law which he had brought was the way of life and death, (Deut. xxx. 19;) and again, "This is the way, walk ye in it;" nor in vain do the Prophets and Apostles, whenever they discourse of the true and entire perfection of righteousness, call us back to the law; nor in vain did Christ reply to the Pharisee, "If thou wouldst enter into life, keep the commandments." (Matt. xix. 17; Luke xviii. 20.) Accordingly, when Paul charges the law with weakness, he does not place the defect in its teaching, as if it could not bestow life but in our flesh. (Rom. vii. viii.)

CANON XXII.

AMEN.

CANON XXIII.

We condemn those who affirm that a man once justified cannot sin, and likewise those who deny that the truly justified ever fall: those in like manner who assert that a man regenerated by the Spirit of God is able to abstain even from the least sins. These are the delirious dreams of fanatics, who either with devilish arrogance deceive, or with hypocrisy fascinate the minds of men, or plot to lead them to the precipice of despair. As to the special privilege of the Virgin Mary, when they produce the celestial diploma we shall believe what they say: for to what do they here give the name of the Church, but just to the Council of Clermont? Augustine was certainly a member of the Church, and though he in one passage chooses, in order to avoid obloquy, rather to be silent respecting the blessed Virgin, he uniformly, without making her an exception, describes the whole race of Adam as involved in sin. Nay, he even almost in distinct terms classes her among sinners, when writing to Marcellinus, he says, They err greatly who hold

that any of the saints except Christ require not to use this prayer, "Forgive us our debts." In so doing, they by no means please the saints whom they laud. Chrysostom and Ambrose, who suspect her of having been tempted by ambition, were members of the Church. All these things I mention for no other end but to let my readers understand that there is no figment so nugatory as not to be classed by these blockheads among the Articles of Faith.

Canon XXIV.

That God visits the good works of the godly with reward, and to former adds new and ampler grace, we deny not. But whosoever asserts that works have the effect of increasing justification, understands neither what is the meaning of justification nor its cause. That we are regarded as righteous when we are accepted by God, has already been proved. From this acceptance, too, works derive whatever grace they had.

Canon XXV.

Solomon is correct when he says that "the ways of a man seem right in his own eyes, but God weigheth the heart." (Prov. xvi. 2.) For how comes it that the horned men of Trent pour forth this execration, but just because they try things by the false balance of their own opinion, not by the weights of God? In the judgment of God nothing is genuine and good, save what flows from perfect love to Him. If the heart of man is never reformed so far in this life, as not to labour under many defects, and to be distracted by various passions, and often tickled by worldly allurements, works must of necessity carry some taint along with them. There is no work, therefore, which is not sin, unless it acquires a value in consequence of a gratuitous estimate.

Canon XXVI.

Such boldness is not strange in men who have never felt any serious fear of the Divine judgment. Let them, if they will, expect eternal life for their good works; only let us on the authority of Paul hope for it from the grace of God. But

it may be said that in thus speaking of grace they do not overthrow it. Although they leave the name of grace to a certain extent, yet so long as consciences in seeking out the cause of salvation look around for works, wo to them! If they waver with trepidation, they have fallen from the certainty of faith: and wo again if they dare to promise themselves any certainty, for they are inflated with devilish presumption! Let the saying of Paul then stand fast—that "the inheritance is not of the law but of faith, that the promise according to grace may be sure to every one that believeth." (Rom. iv. 14.)

CANON XXVII.

As we acknowledge and feel that every sin, inasmuch as it is condemned by the law of God, is mortal, so the Holy Spirit teaches that all sins flow from unbelief, or, at least, from deficiency of faith. Eternal death is indeed the curse which God denounces against adulterers, thieves, and false witnesses; but wherever faith reigns it expels all sin, and so averts the Divine anger in the same way in which one extinguishes a fire by withdrawing the fuel.

CANON XXVIII.

I deny not that, even during the most grievous lapses, some seed of Faith remains, though in a smothered state. However small it is, I admit that it partakes of the nature of true faith: I add, living faith, since otherwise no fruit could come from it. But since it does not appear for a time, nor exhibit itself by the usual signs, it is, in respect of our sense, as if it were dead. But nothing of this kind entered the minds of the Fathers or their dictatorial monks. All they wished was to establish their absurd dogma of an informal and a formal faith. Hence they maintain that faith to be true which is manifestly dead; as if faith could be the life of the soul, (as Augustine, in accordance with the uniform doctrine of Scripture, elegantly terms it,) and yet not be itself alive. To the same purpose they contend that men are Christians though they have no charity, and anathematize those who think otherwise; in other words, according

to them, we anathematize the Holy Spirit if we deride a false profession of Christianity, and set it at nought. Paul pronounced them no Israelites who were not truly the children of Abraham. He moreover defines true Christianity as consisting in "the putting off of the old man;" and he declares that God is denied by those "who do not live godly."

Canon XXIX.

The first article, along with its author, Novatus, we also execrate. As to the second, if the lapsed can only be reinstated in grace by the Sacrament of Penance, what will become of Peter, who, after his dreadful fall, had no access to the remedy which they require as of absolute necessity? Nay, what will become of the tens of thousands in those ages which know nothing of that Auricular Confession which they now represent as the gate of salvation? As to their glorying in the teaching of Christ and his Apostles, their effrontery is extreme, seeing it is clear, from their own historians, that for four hundred years there was no law on the subject of Confession. Therefore, if they would obtain credit for their wicked figments, it will be necessary for them not only to exterminate all the monuments of antiquity, but also to deprive mankind of all sense and judgment!

Canon XXX.

They think that, after the guilt is remitted, the liability to punishment remains. But Scripture everywhere describes, as the fruit of forgiven guilt, that God withdraws his chastisements, and, forgetting his wrath and revenge, blesses us. And when David proclaims those blessed "to whom the Lord imputeth not sin," he not only refers to the remission of guilt, but speaks chiefly of punishment. And what, pray, will be the end or limit, should God begin to exact punishment for sins which are both in number infinite and in weight so heavy, that the hundredth part would sink us to the lowest hell? It is easy indeed for Fathers intoxicated with devilish presumption to call for temporal punishment. To them scarcely anything short of murder is a sin; whoredom is a trivial mistake—the foulest lusts praiseworthy trials

of virtue, a hidden wound of the conscience, a mere bagatelle. But to us, who, after long examination, feeling as it were confused and overwhelmed, are forced at length to break out into these words with David, "Who can understand his errors?" the mode of escape is not so easy. Still we deny not, that sometimes after the guilt is forgiven, God chastises us, but it is in the way of admonition and correction—not vengeance. Their idea that punishment is exacted by the justice of God is therefore a profane fiction. All are not punished in the same way, nor in proportion to their faults; but just according as God knows the application of the rod to be necessary, in order that each, under the training of discipline, may act more wisely in future.

The Fathers, however, here demonstrate what industrious architects they are. Out of one little word they construct a labyrinth composed of a thousand labyrinths. The abyss which they say swallowed up all souls must surely be of immense extent. We see indeed that all the riches of the world are engulfed in it! They ought at least to have spent a little more labour in the construction. There is no mention of Purgatory at all in any part of Scripture. But, as Augustine says, (Ep. 157, ad Optat.,) when a matter naturally obscure cannot be comprehended by us, and Scripture does not come distinctly to our aid, human conjecture is presumptuous in giving any decision. What then must our conclusion be, but that these men act presumptuously in daring, out of their own brains, to make a fabric of that which has no foundation in the word of God? unless, perhaps, they would have us to receive their device of Purgatory as a kind of vaticination vented by ventriloquism; for there is nothing which serves so well to fill their bellies! But what of this? Purgatory cannot stand without destroying the whole truth of Scripture. The demonstration of this would be long, but it is clearly given in our writings. In short, when satisfactions are overthrown, Purgatory of necessity tumbles along with them.

CANON XXXI.

I acknowledge that he who is truly justified will not for-

get that a reward is laid up for him, but be incited by it as the best stimulus to well-doing. And yet he will not look to this alone; for seeing that God requires an ingenuous obedience from his children, he will not only repudiate slavish observance of this description, but utterly reject it. Accordingly, the Holy Spirit, in every part of Scripture, as well as in those words which he puts into the mouth of Paul in the first chapter of the Ephesians, assigns a very different motive to a pious and holy life.

Canon XXXII.

By what right or in what sense the Good Works which the Spirit of Christ performs in us are called ours, Augustine briefly teaches when he draws an analogy from the Lord's Prayer: saying, that the bread which we there ask is called "ours" on no other ground than simply that it is given to us. Accordingly, as the same writer elsewhere teaches, no man will embrace the gifts of Christ till he has forgotten his own merits. He sometimes gives the reason: because, what is called merit is nought else but the free gift of God. Let us therefore allow these Fathers to bawl out, that by separating merit from grace, we are wickedly lacerating what is truly one. He who has learned from our former observations wherein it is that the merit of works consists, will not be greatly dismayed at the sound of the present anathema.

Canon XXXIII.

A very ingenious caution! no man is to see what every man sees! They almost go the length of making void both the glory of God and the grace of Christ. Meanwhile they hurl a dire execration at any one who presumes to think that they derogate in any respect from either. It is just as if a man were to murder another in the open market-place before the eyes of the public, and yet prohibit any one from believing that the murder thus manifest to all has been really committed. Moreover, the rats here turn informers against themselves, by holding out an anathema *in terrorem* against all who shall dare to perceive the impiety of which they themselves are conscious.

SEVENTH SESSION OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

For the completion of the salutary doctrine concerning Justification which was promulgated with the unanimous consent of all the Fathers in the foregoing last Session, it has seemed suitable to treat of the most Holy Sacraments of The Church, by which all true righteousness either begins, or when begun is increased, or when lost is repaired. Wherefore, The Holy, Œcumenical, and General Council of Trent, lawfully met in the Holy Spirit, under the presidency of the foresaid Legates of the Holy See, in order to banish errors, and extirpate the heresies which in this our time have both been stirred up from heresies of old condemned by our Fathers, and invented anew in regard to the most holy sacraments, and which greatly obstruct the purity of the Catholic Church, and the salvation of souls, has deemed it proper, in adhering to the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, the Apostolical Traditions, and the Consent of the Councils and Fathers, to enact and decree these present Canons, intending afterwards, with the help of the Divine Spirit, to publish the others which are required to complete the work thus begun.

OF THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL.

I. Whosoever shall say that the Sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, and are either more or fewer than seven, viz., Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony, or even that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a Sacrament, let him be anathema.

II. Whosoever shall say that these said Sacraments of the

New Law differ not from the Sacraments of the Old Law, except that the ceremonies are different, and the external rites different, let him be anathema.

III. Whosoever shall say that these seven Sacraments are so equal among themselves, that no one is in any respect of greater dignity than another, let him be anathema.

IV. Whosoever shall say that the Sacraments of the New Law are not necessary to salvation, but superfluous, and that without them or a wish for them, men by faith alone obtain the grace of justification, though all are not necessary for each, let him be anathema.

V. Whosoever shall say that these Sacraments were instituted for the sake of nourishing faith alone, let him be anathema.

VI. Whosoever shall say that the Sacraments of the New Law do not contain the grace which they signify, or do not confer grace itself on those placing no obstacle to it, as if they were only external signs of a grace or righteousness received by faith, and a kind of badges of Christian profession, by which believers are distinguished among men from unbelievers, let him be anathema.

VII. Whosoever shall say that grace is not given by Sacraments of this kind, always and to all, as far as depends on the part of God, although they are duly received, but sometimes, and to some persons, let him be anathema.

VIII. Whosoever shall say that by these Sacraments of the New Law grace is not conferred, *ex opere operato*, (from the work performed,) but that faith alone in the Divine promise suffices to obtain grace, let him be anathema.

IX. Whosoever shall say that in the three Sacraments, namely, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, there is not impressed on the soul a character, *i.e.*, some spiritual and indelible sign, owing to which they cannot be repeated, let him be anathema.

X. Whosoever shall say that all Christians have right to administer the word and all the Sacraments, let him be anathema.

XI. Whosoever shall say that in ministers, when they perform and distribute the Sacraments, an intention, at least,

of doing what the Church does, is not requisite, let him be anathema.

XII. Whosoever shall say that a minister, in a state of mortal sin, provided he has observed all the essentials which pertain to the performing and giving of a Sacrament, does not perform or give the Sacrament, let him be anathema.

XIII. Whosoever shall say that the received and approved Rites of the Catholic Church, accustomed to be used in the solemn administration of the Sacraments, may either be despised or omitted, at pleasure, by the minister, without sin, or changed into other new rites, by any pastors of churches, let him be anathema.

OF BAPTISM.

I. Whosoever shall say that the Baptism of John had the same force as the Baptism of Christ, let him be anathema.

II. Whosoever shall say that true and natural water is not of necessity in baptism, and shall accordingly give some metaphorical twist to those words of our Lord Jesus Christ, —"Unless a man be born of water and of the Spirit," let him be anathema.

III. Whosoever shall say that in the Roman Church (which is the mother and mistress of all Churches) there is not the true doctrine of the Sacrament of Baptism, let him be anathema.

IV. Whosoever shall say that the baptism, which is also given by heretics in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, with the intention of doing what the Church does, is not true baptism, let him be anathema.

V. Whosoever shall say that baptism is free, *i.e.*, not necessary to salvation, let him be anathema.

VI. Whosoever shall say that a baptized person cannot lose grace, even though he will it, how much soever he may sin, if he be not unwilling to believe, let him be anathema.

VII. Whosoever shall say that the baptized become by baptism itself only debtors to faith alone, but not to observe the whole Law of Christ, let him be anathema.

VIII. Whosoever shall say that the baptized are free from all the precepts of the Holy Church, which have been either written or handed down, so that they are not bound to observe them, unless they are willing to submit to them of their own accord, let him be anathema.

IX. Whosoever shall say that men are to be recalled to the remembrance of the baptism they received, so that they may understand that all the vows which are made after baptism are void, by virtue of the promise made in said baptism, as if those vows detracted from the faith which they professed, and from baptism itself, let him be anathema.

X. Whosoever shall say that all the sins which are done after baptism are either discharged or made venial by the mere remembrance and faith of baptism received, let him be anathema.

XI. Whosoever shall say that true and duly conferred baptism is to be repeated to him who has denied the faith of Christ among infidels, after he turns to repentance, let him be anathema.

XII. Whosoever shall say that no man is to be baptized, unless at that age at which Christ was baptized, or at the very point of death, let him be anathema.

XIII. Whosoever shall say that infants, in respect they have no act (capacity) of believing, are not to be counted among believers after they have received baptism, and therefore are to be re-baptized after they come to the years of discretion, or that it is better that the baptism of them be omitted, than that they, not believing by their own act, be baptized in the faith only of the Church, let him be anathema.

XIV. Whosoever shall say that such infants, when they grow up, are to be interrogated whether they are willing to ratify what their godfathers promised in their name when they were baptized; and when they answer that they are not willing, are to be left to their own will and not forced to a Christian life in the meanwhile by some punishment, except that they are to be kept back from receiving the Eucharist, and other Sacraments, until they repent, let him be anathema.

OF CONFIRMATION.

I. Whosoever shall say that the Confirmation of Baptism is an idle ceremony, and not rather a true and proper Sacrament, or that anciently it was nothing else than a kind of catechising, by which those on the eve of adolescence explained the reason of their faith in presence of the Church, let him be anathema.

Whosoever shall say that those who attribute any virtue to chrism in the Sacrament of Confirmation insult the Holy Spirit, let him be anathema.

Whosoever shall say that the ordinary minister of holy Confirmation is not the bishop alone, but any simple priest, let him be anathema.

DECREES ON REFORMATION.

The same Holy Council, the same Legates presiding, intending to prosecute the business of Residence and Reformation already commenced, unto the praise of God and increase of the Christian Religion, have thought proper to enact as follows, always without prejudice to the authority of the Apostolic See.

For the government of Cathedral Churches, let no one, unless born of lawful wedlock, and of mature age, gravity of manners, and skill in literature, according to the constitution of Alexander III., which begins, "Whereas in all," promulgated in the Lateran Council, be held qualified.

Let no man, however conspicuous in dignity, rank, or preeminence, presume either to accept or hold at the same time more than one Metropolitan or Cathedral Church by title or *in Commendam*, or under any other name, contrary to the ordinances of the Sacred Canons, since he is to be regarded as very happy to whose lot it has fallen to govern one Church well and fruitfully, and with safety to the souls committed to him. Let those who now hold several Churches, contrary

to the tenor of the present decree, after choosing the one which they wish to retain, be bound to demit the others within six months, if they are at the free disposal of the Apostolic See, or, if otherwise, within a year. Otherwise let the Churches themselves, the last obtained only excepted, be considered *ipso facto* vacant.

Let inferior Ecclesiastical Benefices, especially those having a cure of souls, be conferred on fit and worthy persons, who may be able to reside on the spot, and discharge the cure in person, according to the constitution of Alexander III. in the Lateran Council, beginning, "As some," and another of Gregory, published in the General Council of Lyons, beginning, "Although the Canon." Let any collation or provision made otherwise be held null and void, and let the ordinary giving collation know that he will incur the penalties of the constitution of the General Council, beginning, "Too heavy."

Whosoever, in future, shall have presumed to accept and hold at the same time several Cures, or otherwise incompatible Ecclesiastical Benefices, whether by way of union for life, or of perpetual *Commendam*, or under any other name and title whatsoever, against the form of the Sacred Canons, and especially the constitution of Innocent III., which begins, "Of much," let him be deprived of the benefices, according to the appointment of said constitution *ipso jure*, and also in virtue of the present Canon.

Let the Ordinaries of the places compel all persons whatsoever holding several Cures, or otherwise incompatible Ecclesiastical Benefices, to exhibit their dispensations, and in other respects let them proceed according to the constitution of Gregory X., published in the General Council of Lyons, beginning, "The Ordinaries," which constitution this Holy Council thinks ought to be renewed, and renews it; adding, moreover, that the Ordinaries themselves, even by the deputation of fit vicars, and the assignation of a suitable portion of the fruits, must by all means take care that the cure of souls be in no respect neglected, and the benefices themselves least of all defrauded of due services,—appeals, privileges, and exemptions of whatever sort, even with the deputation

of special judges, and interdicts by them being available to none in the matters aforesaid.

Perpetual Unions within the last forty years may be examined by the Ordinaries as delegates of the Apostolic See, and those which have been obtained by subreption or obreption be declared void. Let those which were granted within the time aforesaid, but have not yet obtained effect, in whole or in part, and those which shall hereafter be made at the instance of any individual, unless it shall appear that they were made from lawful or otherwise reasonable causes, to be verified before the Ordinary of the place, those interested being called, be presumed to have been obtained surreptitiously; and, therefore, let them be altogether without force, unless it shall have been otherwise declared by the Apostolic See.

Let Ecclesiastical Benefices with cure, which are found perpetually united and annexed to Cathedral, Collegiate, or other Churches, and also Monasteries, Benefices, or Colleges, or pious places whatsoever, be visited every year by the Ordinaries of the places, who must be solicitously careful to provide that the cure of souls be laudably performed by fit perpetual vicars, (unless a different arrangement should seem to said Ordinaries to be expedient for the good government of the churches,) to be appointed to the same by them, with a portion (greater or less, at the discretion of said Ordinaries) of the thirds of the fruits to be allocated over a certain subject,—appeals, privileges, exemptions, even with the deputations of judges, and any interdicts of theirs whatsoever being of no force in the matters aforesaid.

Let the Ordinaries of the places be bound to visit all Churches whatsoever, however exempted, once a year with Apostolical authority; and provide, by suitable remedies of law, that those things which need reparation be repaired, and the churches be by no means defrauded of the cure of souls (if any belongs to them) and other due services; appeals, privileges, customs, even those having the prescription of time immemorial, the deputations of judges and their interdicts being utterly excluded.

Let those promoted to greater Churches receive the rite

of consecration within the time appointed by law, and let prorogations granted beyond six months be available to none.

When a See is vacant, it may not be lawful for the Chapter, within a year from the date of the vacancy, to grant license of ordaining, or letters dimissory or reverend, (as some call them,) as well according to the arrangement of the common law, as also in virtue of any privilege or custom whatsoever, to any one who is not constrained by the occasion of an ecclesiastical benefice received or to be received. If it be done otherwise, let the Chapter contravening be liable to ecclesiastical interdict; and those thus ordained, if in inferior orders, enjoy no clerical privilege, especially in criminal matters, and if in higher orders, be suspended, *ipso jure*, from exercising the order, at the pleasure of the future prelate.

Let faculties *de promovendo* not be obtained by any one whatsoever, unless those having a lawful cause why they cannot be ordained by their own bishops, to be expressed in the letters; and even then let them not be ordained, except by a bishop residing in his diocese, or by one exercising the pontifical functions in his stead; and after a careful previous examination.

Let faculties *de non promovendo*, except those granted in cases provided for by law, be effectual only for a year.

Let none presented or elected, or named by any ecclesiastical persons whatsoever, even by the Nuncios of the Apostolic See, be instituted, confirmed, or admitted to any Ecclesiastical Benefices, even under the pretext of any privilege or custom prescribed by time immemorial, unless they have been previously examined and found fit by the Ordinaries of the place; and let them not be able, by means of any appeal, to screen themselves from the obligation to undergo trial,—those presented, chosen, or named by Universities or Colleges of general literature excepted.

In cases of exemption, let the constitution of Innocent IV., beginning "Wishing," published in the General Council of Lyons, be observed, which constitution the present Holy Council has judged proper to renew, and renews: Adding, moreover, in the case of civil causes for wages, and those of indigent persons, secular clergy, or regulars not

living in monasteries, however exempted, although they should have on the spot a certain judge deputed by the Apostolic See; and in these causes, if they have no such judge, let them be convened before the Ordinaries of the bounds as delegated to this effect by said See, and be forced and compelled, by legal means, to pay the debt,—no privileges, exemptions, deputations of conservators and their interdicts being of any avail against the aforesaid.

Let Ordinaries take care that all Hospitals be faithfully and carefully managed by their administrators, under whatever named called, or however exempted; observing the form of the constitution of the Council of Vienna, beginning "As it happens:" which constitution the Holy Council has deemed proper to renew, and renews, with the exceptions therein contained.

Antidote to the Seventh Session.

How much sweat must be spent in any contest where a bad cause is pleaded, the venerable Fathers had experienced in last Session. Therefore, that they might not over-fatigue themselves by a second conflict, they preferred to return to their compendious method of settling the matter by fulmination. And, indeed, it was unbecoming their dictatorial style to undergo the trouble of rendering a reason. What then! The Corybantes sound their brass and redouble the clang. Tremble, boys! Whoever possesses a spark of manly courage will despise their futile crepitations, and boldly, with unruffled mind, inquire into the contents of their decrees. How they teem with stupid absurdities I engage to demonstrate with my finger.

Canon I.

They insist that Seven Sacraments were instituted by

Christ. Why, then, did they not order him to institute them? The number Seven which they place under the sanction of an anathema has not only no support from Scripture, but none even from any approved author. This is little. Of the Sacraments which they enumerate we shew that some were temporary, as the anointing of the sick, and others, falsely so called, as matrimony. The arguments by which we evince this are plain and strong. What! will they boast that they have the gift of healing? If anointing is the symbol of that gift, are they not apes when they use it without the reality? Again, what promise is there in this ceremony that has any application to us? If a sacrament consists of spiritual grace and an external sign, where will they find anything of the kind in penance? For giving marriage this name they have no other reason than the gross ignorance of the monks, who reading in the Epistle to the Ephesians (Eph. v. 32) the word *sacrament* used instead of *mystery*, and that concerning the secret union between Christ and his Church, transferred it to marriage. Of all these things our writings contain clear and copious demonstrations, which the good Fathers refute by the one vocable *anathema*. This is to conquer without a contest, or rather to triumph without a victory!

Canon II.

Since the Sacraments of both Testaments have the same Author, the same promises, the same truth, and the same fulfilment in Christ, we justly say that they differ from each other in external signs, but agree in those things which I have mentioned, or, in one word, in the reality. For as they are appendages of doctrine, but the substance of the doctrine is the same, so the same rule holds in regard to the Sacraments. My readers perhaps would not understand the object of the Fathers of Trent in launching this thunderbolt, did I not briefly explain. There is a vulgar dogma of the sophists, that the Sacraments of the Mosaic law figured grace, but that ours exhibit it. We maintain that God was always true in his promises, and from the beginning figured nothing which he did not exhibit to the ancient Church in reality; for

the reality of circumcision was evident under Moses. Paul testifies that they then partook of the same spiritual food and the same spiritual drink. (1 Cor. x. 3.) What answer do they give but just that it is otherwise taught in the schools? I only touch in a few words on matters which my readers will, if they please, learn fully from our writings. Let this be the sum. From the Word of God, not from the decrees of Romanists, are we to learn what difference or resemblance there is between the Sacraments. Still we deny not that a more exuberant grace is received under the kingdom of Christ, and accordingly we are wont to note a twofold difference. *First*, that our Sacraments do not point out Christ at a distance, as if he were absent, but exhibit him as with the finger. *Secondly*, as the mode of revelation is more ample, so the communication of grace is more exuberant.

Canon III.

Who would not face the Neptunian bolt sooner than put the inventions of men on a footing with the ordinances of Christ? We read that Baptism was recommended by Christ: we read in like manner that the Lord's Supper was recommended. (Matth. xxvii. xxviii.) Of the others we read nothing of the kind: nay, for many ages after, the doctrine of these men was unknown. There can be no doubt as to the aim and force of our Saviour's question, "The baptism of John, was it from heaven or of men?" For he means that it would not be legitimate if it had not come down from heaven. Wherefore let us decide in all safety on the authority of Christ, that there is no danger in repudiating whatever has emanated merely from human authority. Not contented, however, with claiming equal authority for all, they prefer the chrism of their confirmation to the baptism of Christ! For their making one of more dignity than another is not for the purpose of placing those which have no support from Scripture in an inferior grade, but they renew those execrable blasphemies which the Council of Aurelium first vented—that we are made only half Christians by baptism, and are finished by confirmation!—and other things there delivered to the same effect.

Canon IV.

I will readily allow that the use of those things which Christ gave us as helps to salvation is necessary, that is, when an opportunity is given: although believers are always to be reminded that there is no other necessity for any sacrament than that of an instrumental cause, to which the power of God is by no means to be tied down. Every pious person must with his whole heart shudder at the expression that the things are superfluous. But here the worthy Fathers, with their usual stupidity, perceive not that whatever grace is conferred upon us by the Sacraments, is nevertheless to be ascribed to faith. He who separates faith from the Sacraments, does just as if he were to take the soul away from the body. Therefore, as we exclude not the doctrine of the gospel when we say that we obtain the grace of Christ by faith alone, so neither do we exclude the Sacraments, the nature of which is the same, as they are seals of the gospel.

Canon V.

We acknowledge that the Sacraments are intended, not only to maintain but to increase faith. But these horned gentry mean something else; for they pretend that the Sacraments have a magical power, which is efficacious without faith. This error destroys the relation which the Scriptures uniformly establish between the Sacraments and faith. That my readers may perceive this more clearly, they must always call to mind, that the Sacraments are nothing but instrumental causes of bestowing grace upon us, and are beneficial, and produce their effect only when they are subservient to faith.

Canon VI.

Here these preposterous men mix dross with silver. Wherefore we must make a distinction:—First, then, if there are any who deny that the Sacraments contain the grace which they figure, we disapprove of them. But when the horned Fathers add that the Sacraments of themselves con-

fer grace on those not opposing any obstacle to it, they pervert the whole force of Sacraments. For they always relapse into the old delirium of the sophists, that even unbelievers receive the grace which is offered in the Sacraments, provided they do not reject it by opposing other obstacles—as if unbelief were not in itself obstacle enough. Let us hold, therefore, that we cannot obtain the grace offered in the Sacraments, unless we are capacitated by faith. What immediately follows they have appended either very maliciously, or very absurdly. They say, "as if they were only external signs;" nay, they speak as if there was no alternative between these two things. As we repudiate the monkish fiction, that the Sacraments are available in any other way than by faith, so we willingly conjoin with the signs a true exhibition of the reality, holding that they have no effect without faith, and yet that they are not empty and naked signs of a distant grace.

CANON VII.

The first thing was to define what it is duly to receive the Sacraments. For this swinish herd, passing by faith, and placing repentance in the back-ground—not indeed that ceremonial repentance which they loudly extol, but that inward repentance of the heart, by which the whole man turns to God—think that the due receiving of the Sacraments consists in some sort of simulate devotion, as they term it. But if we were agreed as to what constitutes a legitimate disposition, there would be no farther dispute as to efficacy. For who doubts that the grace which God promises is exhibited to those who make a due approach? Hence, every one moderately instructed in the pure use of the Sacraments, will perceive that they make an absurd distinction when they say, that in so far as relates to God, grace is given, for, be the unworthiness of man what it may, God must always remain true. In respect of God, therefore, nothing is withheld or deducted from the efficacy of the Sacraments, however unbecoming the profanation of them, in respect of the evil conscience of man. The effect only is lost, or at least intercepted from coming to us.

Canon VIII.

Here, indeed, they disclose their impiety, not only more clearly, but also more grossly. The device of *opus operatum* is recent, and was coined by illiterate monks, who had never learned anything of the nature of Sacraments. For in Sacraments God alone properly acts; men bring nothing of their own, but approach to receive the grace offered to them. Thus, in Baptism, God washes us by the blood of his Son, and regenerates us by his Spirit; in the Supper he feeds us with the flesh and blood of Christ. What part of the work can man claim, without blasphemy, while the whole appears to be of grace? The fact of the administration being committed to men, derogates no more from the operation of God than the hand does from the artificer, since God alone acts by them, and does the whole. But those blockheads, to say nothing of their finding human merit in the free gifts of God, pretend that we, in doing nothing, merit from God, and lay him under liability to us; and not contented with this, give vent to monstrous words to extort a confession from God, that he is not to be regarded as acting alone in the Sacraments,—hence their additional inference necessarily follows, viz., that grace is not received by faith alone. For if we grant their postulate—that grace is procured in the Sacraments *opere operato*—a part of merit is separated from faith, and the use of the Sacraments is in itself effectual for salvation. But if the same thing is to be affirmed of the Sacraments as of the word, then the Apostle is a witness that they are of no avail unless received by faith.

Canon IX.

Their fable of an indelible character is the product of the same forge. It was altogether unknown to the Primitive Church, and is more suited to magical charms than to the sound doctrine of the gospel! Therefore it will be repudiated with the same facility with which it was devised. That Baptism is not to be repeated the pious are sufficiently agreed. This, which was true of Baptism, they afterwards rashly transferred to their Confirmation and Orders. The

curious sought for a reason. That they might not seem to say nothing, they contrived this fictitious impression, and now they denounce anathema against all who assent not to their figment.

Canon X.

No sound Christian makes all men equal in the administration of Word and Sacraments, not only because all things ought to be done in the Church decently and in order, but also because, by the special command of Christ, Ministers are ordained for that purpose. Therefore, as a special call is required, no man who is not called may take the honour upon himself. Moreover, where do they find the office of baptizing enjoined on women, as they permit them to do?

Canon XI.

The lavishness with which they pour out their anathemas shews that they set little value upon them. Their prattle about the intention of consecrating was produced by the sophists without any show of reason. This, though not tolerable, would be less grievous, if it did not utterly overthrow whatever solid comfort believers have in the Sacraments, and suspend the truth of God on the will of man: for if the intention of the minister is necessary, none of us can be certain of his Baptism—none approach the Holy Supper with sure confidence. I was baptized—if it so pleased the priest, whose good faith is no more known to me than that of any Ethiopian! Whether the promise of Christ in the Holy Supper is to be good to me, depends on the nod of a man whom I do not know. What kind of faith can it be that depends on the secret will of another? And yet this herd fear not to threaten us with windy anathemas, if we do not on the instant subscribe to such blasphemies. Such is my deference for the holy ordinance of Christ, that if some epicurean, inwardly grinning at the whole performance, were to administer the Supper to me according to the command of Christ and the rule given by him, and in due form, I would not doubt that the bread and the cup held forth by his hand are pledges to me of the body and the blood

of Christ. It is painful to discuss such silliness, as when they say, "at least of doing what the Church does." Here they re-ech othe dictates of their masters. Who that has his eyes sees not that this is just equivalent to enjoining in one word all that monks have ever dreamed in their dens or sophists babbled in their quarrels? How stupid and absurd soever they may be, they must nevertheless be held firm and sure.

Canon XII.

Amen.

Canon XIII.

What they mean by the received and approved Rites of the Church every one is aware. Hence by this *caveat* they establish whatever superstitions human presumption has superinduced on the pure ordinances of the Lord. The genuine rite of Baptism is simple, and the administration of the Supper simple, if we look to what the Lord has enjoined. But under how many, and how various and discordant additions has this simplicity been buried? They will say, that if there is any excess, it behoves to be rescinded—only, however, if they think so. But what hope do they give us, when with bacchanalian fury they belch forth their anathemas against whosoever permits himself to omit one little ceremony? All the godly complain, or at least regret, that in Baptism more is made of the chrism, the taper, the salt, the spittle in fine, than the washing with water, in which the whole perfection of Baptism consists. They deplore that the Supper has not only been vitiated by impure additions, but converted into a kind of spurious show. According to the Fathers of Trent, nothing can be so monstrous as not to find a place among the approved rites of the Catholic Church. Augustine, even in his time, complained that the Church was burdened with a Jewish bondage, though the rites then in use were scarcely a tenth part of those the observance of which is now more rigidly required than that of any human or divine law. The men of Trent deliberate as to what should be done, and then, without holding out

any hope of relief, launch curses and imprecations at all who will not submit to every iota of the usages prescribed!

Antidote to the Canons on Baptism.

Canon I.

A great matter certainly to determine, that when the doctrine is the same, the grace offered the same, and the rites observed the same, there is a similitude. If in these three things the Baptism of Christ differs in any respect from that of John, I admit that they have gained the day; but if they are all common to both, in vain do they vent their bile. Nobody of composed mind will be frightened. Had they thought that reason was to decide, they would have been far more moderate.

Canon II.

Why they raise a question on the former point I know not, unless perhaps this is the one only method in which they wish to be wise in checking the frivolous subtleties of the Sorbonists. But they are too passionate in fulminating against all who differ from them in the exposition of a single passage, especially when no ancient writer can be quoted who gives a metaphorical meaning to the words, "Unless men be born of water and of the Spirit." But as I said at the beginning, having a rich storehouse of execration, there is no wonder that they are liberal in dealing them out.

Canon III.

Why did they not rather begin with this, since on this, as the foundation, they might raise any superstructure? For if all they teach is true, why are we still fighting? But our writings clearly shew that the whole doctrine of Baptism, as taught by them, is partly mutilated, partly vicious. Now, while they are unable to refute our arguments, it is vain to think of hiding themselves under the flash of an anathema! When

they proudly call Rome the mother and witness of all Churches, what effrontery? Did she beget in Christ the Greek and Eastern Churches, by which rather she was begotten? What teaching of hers could reach other Churches which had far more learned Bishops? Let them bring forward all the most distinguished men they have ever had, will they out of the whole catalogue produce one equal either to Cyprian, or Ambrose, or Augustine?

Canon IV.

What the Minister intends to do is of little consequence to us, provided the action itself corresponds to the genuine ordinance of Christ, both in doctrine and ritual. Let it suffice us then to have been baptized in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, whatever may have been the ignorance or impiety of those who administered Baptism to us. Man is merely the hand; it is Christ alone who truly and properly baptizes.

Canon V.

That the unskilful may not be imposed upon, we must tell them that there is a middle place between *free* and *necessary*, in the sense in which the Romanists use the latter term. We, too, acknowledge that the use of Baptism is necessary —that no one may omit it from either neglect or contempt. In this way we by no means make it free (optional.) And not only do we strictly bind the faithful to the observance of it, but we also maintain that it is the ordinary instrument of God in washing and renewing us; in short, in communicating to us salvation. The only exception we make is, that the hand of God must not be tied down to the instrument. He may of himself accomplish salvation. For when an opportunity of Baptism is wanting, the promise of God alone is amply sufficient. But of this subject something was said on a former Session.

Canon VI.

The paradox which they condemn we also repudiate, were it only for this one reason, that it extinguishes the life of faith.

CANON VII.

Did they understand what the law of Christ is, they would without difficulty agree as to the rest; but from the way in which they are wont to speak of the law of Christ, they demonstrate by this one head how far they are from the true knowledge of Baptism. Nor am I unaware what it is that has misled them. For as Paul teaches, that by circumcision a man was bound to keep the law of Moses, (Gal. v. 3,) so they make out a similar obligation in Baptism in respect of the law of Christ. And the comparison would be apt did they not stumble, so to speak, on the very threshold: for they err exceedingly in thinking that Paul is there discoursing of the use and not rather of the abuse of circumcision. For if all who were circumcised were debtors to keep the whole law, it follows that they were liable to the curse. But Paul teaches very differently when he calls circumcision a seal of the righteousness of faith. (Rom. iv. 11.) Those who pretended that working was meritorious made a profession of keeping the law. What is Baptism to us in the present day? Although it is a deed of mutual obligation between us and God, it has this as its special property, viz., to make us certain of the free forgiveness of sins, and the perpetual gift of adoption. This is as repugnant to the affirmation of Trent as freedom is contrary to slavery.

CANON VIII.

There is one Lawgiver, says James, who is able to save and to destroy. When they have demonstrated this to be false, we will not refuse to bind ourselves by their laws. But so long as it shall appear that God has taken the consciences of the godly under the government of his word, and claims this as his right, we may safely conclude that there is no Holy Church which will attempt to fetter consciences by other laws.

CANON IX.

The first thing to have determined was, What are lawful vows? This being fixed, little or no dispute would remain.

But now the vows under which wretched souls are put, or rather strangled, are not only full of superstition, but altogether at variance with the right rule of Christian life. Wherefore, to make any vow binding, it ought to be required at the profession of Baptism. If this be so, there is not one of the vows used in the Papacy at the present day that will not be void.

Canon X.

Those who hold that sins are effaced by the mere remembrance of Baptism, do not mean a bare or frigid remembrance, but are conjoined with faith and repentance. Such also is the primary view of Baptism. For we ought to turn our thoughts not only to the sprinkling of water, but to the spiritual reality which begets the confidence of a good conscience by the resurrection of Christ, as Peter speaks. (1 Pet. iii. 21.) Such remembrance, I say, not only makes sins venial, but altogether obliterates them. Whenever the question relates to the forgiveness of sins, we must flee to Baptism, and from it seek a confirmation of forgiveness. For as God reconciles us to himself by the daily promises of the gospel, so the belief and certainty of this reconciliation, which is daily repeated even to the end of life, he seals to us by Baptism. We were indeed baptized once, but there is a perpetual testimony of pardon and free propitiation in Christ.

What do the venerable Fathers say? Out of the trite rhapsodies of the sophists they restrict the promises of Baptism to the past, and the moment any one has sinned, burying all remembrance of Baptism, they enjoin him to rest in the fictitious Sacrament of Penance—as if Baptism were not itself a proper Sacrament of Penance. And still they will boast that they hold sound doctrine on the subject of Baptism, although they comprehend all its force in a momentary and evanescent promise of grace.

To the next three heads I not unwillingly subscribe. On the fourth I agree with them so far, but would wish my readers to observe what a deluge of anathemas they have poured forth. What they disapprove dropt on some occasion

from Erasmus, perhaps, without much consideration. This I deny not, and yet a candid interpreter would only desire some correction in the terms, and conclude that the author of them was not fully versant in the government of the Church. No man of equity and moderation will fly at once to the terrors of an anathema.

Antidote to the Canons on Confirmation.

Canon I.

As this anathema has two edges, I hasten, in order to avoid being smitten with the former one, to declare that I am certainly not of the number of those who think that Confirmation, as observed under the Roman Papacy, is an idle ceremony, inasmuch as I regard it as one of the most deadly wiles of Satan. Let us remember that this pretended Sacrament is nowhere recommended in Scripture, either under this name or with this ritual, or this signification. Let us now hear with what titles they adorn their figment. In the name of Pope Melciades, (De Consecrat. Dist. 5,) they declare that the Spirit is given in Baptism for innocence, in Confirmation for increase of grace—that Baptism is sufficient for those who were instantly to die, but by Confirmation, those who are to prove victorious are armed so as to be able to sustain the contest. Thus one half of the efficacy of Baptism is lopt off, as if it were said in vain, that in Baptism the old man is crucified, in order that we may walk in newness of life. (Rom. vi. 6.) They add, besides, that though neither of the two is perfect without the other, yet Confirmation must be regarded with higher veneration than Baptism. For there is a decree of the Council of Aurelium, that no man should be deemed a Christian who has not been anointed by Episcopal unction. These words are fit to be propounded to children in sport. Sacrilege so replete with execrable blasphemy does indeed differ much from an idle ceremony.

Of the second branch of this head, what shall I say but that they have no mean idea of the effect which their ana-

themas are to have: they pour them forth as readily as if they thought they are immediately to make white black. But the truth is, that from the wonder or rather stupor with which they have seen their mysteries hitherto regarded by the vulgar, they have imagined that all their babble will be similarly received. Hence their exceeding confidence. Never would they have ventured to expose their absurdities to the judgment of the rudest hind had they not hoped that the mask of Council would hoodwink all eyes.

Canon II.

The question is, whether oil, the moment after they have been pleased to call it Chrism, receives, at the will of man, a new and secret virtue of the Spirit? Oil is not mentioned by any ancient Christian writer, nay, not even by any one of that middle age wherein numerous errors abounded. Let them do what they may, therefore, they will gain nothing by denying that they insult the Spirit of God when they transfer his virtue to filthy oil.

Canon III.

Of a truth the horned and mitred herd are worthy of such a privilege. For what could they do, seeing they are no fitter to execute the Episcopal office than hogs are to sing? Verily I do not envy them; only let them confine their impurities to their taverns, and keep them out of the Church of God. But how, pray, will they prove that this office is more befitting Bishops than other priests, unless that it hath so pleased some unknown authors? If a reason be sought from Scripture, all confess that it makes no distinction between a Bishop and a Presbyter. Then Paul is enjoined to receive imposition of hands from Ananias who was one of the disciples. (Acts ix. 17.) If imposition of hands is their Confirmation, why do they not charge God with violating orders, and so profaning a mystery by confounding Presbyter and Bishop? In short, their doctrine is sanctioned either by a law of God or by human decree. If by a law of God, why are they not afraid to violate it? For they give Presbyters a right to confirm on extraordinary occasions.

While they thus thunder away in behalf of a human decree, who will be afraid?

Antidote to the subsequent Canons on Residence.

I sometimes wonder how it happens that, in such light of the gospel, they are just as absurd as they were wont to be in the thickest darkness. But I immediately turn to reflect on the admirable judgment of God, by which it is certain that they are so blinded and stupified, that, lost both to sight and feeling, they cast away all shame, and glory unblushingly in their own disgrace. Since the provisions of the Church, which were destined for the maintenance of pastors long ago, have begun to be the revenues of idle men, and those who are maintained at the expense of the Church think that no obligation lies upon them, they profess to have prepared themselves for the correction of this great iniquity. When they enter upon the subject they seem to say something. Where corruption is so rampant, it is, I admit, no small matter that two bishoprics are not to be held by one man. And there are other things of a similar nature, framed to curb the licentiousness which now stalks abroad, although in any reformation which they attempt, they are far, I say not from the primitive and austerer discipline which flourished a thousand years ago, but from any tolerable state of pious and well ordered government. They forbid a Bishop to absent himself from his diocese for more than half a year. The leave is liberal enough which gives six months' vacation out of twelve to those who ought to watch continually over the flock, both day and night. But even here a reservation is added—unless they have a just excuse for absence. When will they be without such excuse? And yet, supposing they most strictly observe what is here prescribed, what benefit will result, unless, perhaps, that they will not be able to carry out of the district all the money which the living yields? If they love the city, they will have their palaces where, away from all noise, they will drink, play, and sleep as usual; if they prefer the country, they will have pleasant

retreats in their seats and castles. Thus they will perform their office doing nothing, and yet giving actual residence.

As to parishes, they confirm schools in their privileges, so that the pretext of studying will excuse absence. Meanwhile, while the young and raw tyro learns to act the pastor, will he nevertheless draw the milk of the flock which will be left without a pastor. Grant that this may be tolerated, yet who knows not that lazy scullions alone enjoy the privileges of the Schools? The consequence will be, that the miserable churches will be forced to rear two wolves, one at home and another abroad. The resolution not to give effect in future to dispensations *de non promovendo*, beyond a year, was, I shrewdly guess, suggested by the granters. For what an addition will be made to their gains, if a new prerogative shall require to be purchased every year? In short, their only care seems to have been to exhibit some show of justice in a state of universal confusion.

But even if their regulations had been perfect to a title, good men could not congratulate themselves on the prospect of a better state of matters. For before they enact any law they abrogate all laws together, by one word, or at least point out a method by which they may all be abrogated: for they promise that none of the things which they may say are to hinder the Apostolic See from maintaining its authority unimpaired. Now, let any one consider with himself by what limits that authority is bounded, or how far it extends. Does not a preliminary of this kind just mean, that the Popes may order anything to be lawful that they please? What remedy, pray, do they bring by so acting? None of the things which they undertake to correct have hitherto been practised as if permitted by common law, but what the laws prohibited was done with impunity by means of dispensations. Accordingly, those guilty of abuses never alleged that they observed the strict rule, but having been set free from law, they thought they might do what otherwise in itself was not lawful. The Neptunian fathers now provide that the future shall be no better, by making a special proviso that the power of the Roman Court shall suffer no diminution. For though a thousand knots of laws were tied,

the sword of Alexander is unsheathed to cut them all at once. Could they more openly mock the Christian world? Why do I say mock? Could they more grossly insult the expectation of the good, than when they deliver thus distinctly, and with barbarian haughtiness, that they will set no bounds to the unbridled tyranny of the Pope?

Callous as those who live under the Papacy have become to all evils, it might be said that on this one matter they had forgotten their bondage, I mean, in not only freely lamenting but crying aloud that the Church was ruined by dispensations. All eyes were turned to the venerable Fathers, sitting like strict and zealous censors to check the abuse. After pondering for eighteen months they declare their approval of ancient discipline, provided the Roman See retain its right of dispensing as before. In other words, the laws are to be so far enforced that liberty to violate them shall not be gratuitous, but may be purchased. And that the Pope may not be prevented by modesty from boldly exercising the power, they confirm him in the title of Universal Bishop, which Gregory calls nefarious, blasphemous, abominable, and the forerunner of Antichrist, while they leave nothing more to the Bishops than to be his Vicars. Where is that equality which Jerome heralds when he compares the Bishop of Rome to the Bishop of Eugubium? (Hierom. ad Evag.) Where is the doctrine of Cyprian that the Bishopric of Christ is one, and part of it is held entire (*in solidum*) by each Bishop? (Cyp. de Simplic. Prelat.) Bernard writes that it was a common complaint in his time, that the Churches were maimed and mutilated, because the Roman Bishop by drawing all power to himself confounded orders. (Bernard. de Consid. ad Eng. lib. 3.) To cure this evil the Holy Council bids Bishops be the Vicars of the Pope.

I will spend no more time in exposing their impudence. But as all see that they are worse than hopeless, every one who is wise will in future disregard their decrees, and be in no dubiety about them. It were indeed most desirable that the dissensions by which the Church is now disturbed should be settled by the authority of a pious Council, but as

matters are we cannot yet hope for it. Therefore, since Churches are scattered in a dreadful manner, and no hope of gathering them together appears from man, each cannot do better than hasten to rally round the banner which the Son of God holds out to us. This is not a time to keep waiting for one another. As every one sees the light of Scripture beaming forth, let him instantly follow. In regard to the whole body of the Church, we commend it to the care of its Lord. Meanwhile, let us not be either slothful or secure. Let each do his best. Let us contribute whatever in us is of counsel, learning, and abilities, to build up the ruins of the Church. But, in affairs so desperate, let us be sustained and animated by the promise that, as none appears from among men to undertake the office with manly and heroic mind, THE LORD, armed with His own justice and with the weight of His own arm, will Himself alone perform all things.

THE ADULTERO-GERMAN INTERIM:

TO WHICH IS ADDED

THE TRUE METHOD OF GIVING PEACE TO CHRISTENDOM,

AND OF

REFORMING THE CHURCH.

THE INTERIM, OR DECLARATION OF RELIGION,

OF

HIS IMPERIAL MAJESTY CHARLES V.

BEING A CONSTITUTION PRESCRIBING THE MODE IN WHICH THE STATES OF THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE SHOULD MUTUALLY CONDUCT THEMSELVES AND TREAT EACH OTHER UNTIL THE DECISION OF A GENERAL COUNCIL.

PUBLISHED BY HIS IMPERIAL MAJESTY IN THE DIET HELD AT AUGSBURG 15TH MAY, AND ACCEPTED BY THE STATES OF THE EMPIRE, A.D. 1548.

His Sacred Imperial Majesty, our most clement Lord, to the Electors, Princes, and other States of The Holy Roman Empire, and the Deputies of those absent, orders the following Intimation to be made:—

Although his Sacred Imperial Majesty, from the commencement of his reign, had nothing more at heart than to consider and promote whatever might in any way be conducive throughout the whole world, and especially The Holy Empire of the Germanic Nation as his beloved country, to the honour, advantage, and prosperity of said Nation, and to preserve under the wings and happy administration of His Majesty the peace, concord, and tranquillity of all ranks: yet His Majesty perceived long ago, by clear enough signs and experience in fact, that without the Christian settlement, or lawful determination of this most pernicious dissension on the subject of religion, from which all the discord, rancour, wars, difficulties, and grievances of the States have hitherto proceeded, no hope of such firm peace, justice, and concord remained: Therefore His Majesty, after holding various Conferences and Negotiations on the subject, has left no stone unturned in order that this fatal dissension might be brought to a Christian concord, or a sounder understanding.

But when, in the prosecution of this work, the case itself declared that that dissension had struck its roots so deep that it now affected not only the Germanic but also many other nations, and has begun to be common to them all, so that it appeared that to this so grievous disease no more convenient remedy could be applied than by the way of an Universal Catholic Council: His Majesty, on the prayer of The States, at length obtained, after many negotiations held on the subject, that a General Council was convened, and was begun to be held at Trent in the Germanic territory. Wherefore, also, at the commencement of these Diets, he so dealt with The States, and persuaded them that, following in the footsteps of our holy fathers and ancestors, who in matters of faith were ever wont to recur to Sacred Councils, and obey the same, they agreed in common to adhere and submit to this Council, and further left it free to His Majesty to devise Christian and convenient means by which, in the interval, until the end and determination of the Council, all The States might live and dwell together piously and peacefully, so that none should be aggrieved contrary to right and equity. And as His Majesty at that time received such consent and submission of The States with most clement mind, so he now also no less receives it.

On the subject of said Submission, as in itself most weighty, His Majesty has hitherto, in paternal affection, deliberated faithfully and with the utmost care, and has earnestly sought the sentiments of the States, (as they themselves know;) and after thoroughly weighing the matter, has with heartfelt sorrow perceived what immense inconveniences this illustrious Nation has suffered hitherto from foresaid dissension; what calamity and destruction are threatened by the same, so that inevitable necessity demands, for the establishment and preservation of firm peace, justice, and unity, and for removing the seeds of discord, that we do not leave this matter even till the progress and determination of the General Council, as it were suspended in its present state and confusion, but rather bring it back to Christian concord, moderation, and a sounder and closer understanding, and no more connive at the various contrary opinions coming in, or allow that by them the public peace be any more disturbed or impeded.

While, then, His Imperial Majesty was wholly occupied with this matter, it happened very opportunely that certain persons of high rank and name, no doubt from right zeal for Christian concord, peace, and tranquillity, and true love toward their country, laid

before His Majesty this Counsel, and opinion of theirs here added, delivered it to be more thoroughly discussed, and promised that they would diligently observe it.

This Counsel His Majesty submitted to the inspection of some excellent Doctors skilled in the Sacred Scriptures, and approved, from whose Report it has been observed, that if it is understood in a right Christian sense, it is not at variance with our true Catholic Religion and Ecclesiastical Doctrines, Statutes, and Ordinances, except in two Articles concerning Communion under both kinds, and the Marriage of Priests; but tends to promote and obtain a fuller concord on controverted points of the Christian religion, and preserve public peace and tranquillity in The Holy Empire, as it also so appears to His Majesty, the nature of these times considered: And he has nothing more at heart than that all orders under his Imperial Government, as is incumbent from this office on His Majesty, should live and meet together in religious peace and concord.

Therefore, His Majesty of his clemency requires the Common States, who have hitherto observed the Ordinances and Statutes of the Universal Church, to continue to observe them in future, steadfastly remain and persevere in them, and not deviate from them, or change them in any respect, as they have constantly declared they would do. The other States, who have begun innovation, His Majesty, in like manner, clemently and earnestly requires that they either again connect themselves with the Common States, and agree with them in the observance of the Statutes and Ceremonies of the Universal Catholic Church, or at least conform themselves entirely, in their Doctrine and Ecclesiastical Ordinances, to the foresaid Counsel, and neither institute nor attempt anything beyond it; and that in case they have gone farther, they conform in all things to the foresaid Counsel and Confession, and firmly abide therein; and that all the States, for the furtherance of public peace, quiet, and union, tolerate the foresaid writing for the present, and not impugn it, or teach, write, or preach against it; but that all the States wait patiently and studiously for the Declaration and Determination of The Universal Council.

Nevertheless, His Majesty will use all diligence, and leave nothing untried, in order that an Universal Council, according to the Requisition of The States, may be held as soon as possible, and the Germanic nation be entirely delivered from the present Schism.

In like manner, also, His Majesty is now wholly occupied in considering how some Catholic Reformation may be framed, to be published by The States themselves during the present diets; of which (Reformation) it may be hoped that it will not a little contribute, until the determination of the said Council, to the removal of abuses and scandals, and the plantation and preservation of Catholic Discipline, regularity of life, and virtue.

And seeing that, in the often-named Counsel, under the rubric of Ceremonies, it is contained, *inter alia*, that if anything has grown up among them which might give rise to Superstition, it be taken away, &c., His Majesty reserves to himself, in regard to it and the other Articles, when and so far as shall be necessary, now or hereafter, at all times the power of conveniently statuting and arranging. For whatever His Majesty, to promote the glory of God, to settle Religious Controversy, to maintain firm peace, justice, and tranquillity in The Holy Germanic Empire, in short, for the advantage of and convenience of the States, will be able to undertake, institute, effect, and promote, he therein declares himself with all clemency, according to his imperial office, to be most ready.

This much, to declare the will of His Imperial Majesty, we deemed it right clemently and benignly to intimate to the common States of the Empire.

THE ADULTERO-GERMAN INTERIM.

Chapter I.—Of the Condition of Man before the Fall.

1. God at first created man after his own image and likeness, (Gen. i.,) and adorned him with grace, and by means of original righteousness made him to be right in all the powers of his body as well as his soul, and not actuated by any turbulent and depraved notions, but in him the flesh obeyed the spirit, and the inferior powers of the soul the superior powers which so strongly invited him to God.

2. Seeing then that the soul of man was so well constituted, God left him so far in the hand of his own counsel, (Ecclus. xv.,) that he had no less power to choose good than evil.

3. Had he used this his freedom rightly, and obeyed the commands which God had given him, he would have preserved the blessings which he had received, and righteousness for himself and all his posterity, and nothing would have been wanting to him and his posterity for living well and happily: no hunger, nor thirst, nor cold, nor heat, nor pain, nor disease, nor death would have afflicted him: in short, he would have avoided all vice and sin, nor from them as the wages of sin would any danger have been brought to him and his posterity.

Chapter II.—Of the Condition of Fallen Man.

1. But after our first parent did contrary to what God had commanded, (Rom. v.) he incurred the penalty appointed by God, and lost the most fair gift of original righteousness. Hence there was a want of this righteousness, (Eph. ii.,) together with a vicious habit of concupiscence, which is perpetually at war with the spirit and the higher powers of the soul. This sin, (*i.e.*, the privation of that righteousness by which it rendered the reason subject to God,) together with concupiscence, he propagated to all his posterity, so that all men whatsoever that come into this world (Job xxv.) are born with it, and none is free from it, not even the child of one day, according to the Scriptures.

2. Hence that wound of our nature, that the animal man perceives not the things which are spirit, (1 Cor. ii.,) nor before grace desires and freely chooses the same, seeing that the concupiscence and affection of the flesh which rule in him are enmity against God, and abhorrent from the law of God, (Rom. viii.,) and impede him the more in good, the more they impel him to evil.

3. And though such a man retains freedom of will, though weak and injured, and from it as from a fountain both the moral virtues of the heathen, and the actings of these (virtues) flow, yet before the grace of God and renovation he cannot aspire to a righteousness which is valid before God, but is rather the slave of sin, the bondman of Satan, the enemy of God, and liable to the evils of this world: for he is pressed by hunger, thirst, cold, heat, pain, disease, and is

at last overcome by death itself. For by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin. (Rom. v.) But then punishments of that first transgression are common to the regenerate as well as sinners. In the case of the former, however, they are employed by God for discipline, whereas they are inflicted as punishment on the unrighteous and ungodly.

4. And that in man thus depraved by original sin, so long as nature only continues and is not renewed by grace, along with depraved concupiscence Satan also reigns, who holds him bound with the chains of his slavery, and works in him so that he corresponds in his desires, doing the will and mind of the flesh, and crowns the original sin which he drew from his parents with actual sins, and is, as the Apostle says, (Eph. ii.,) a child of wrath, so that if he dies in this his most wretched condition, being at length thrown into hell by the just judgment of God, he there suffers eternal punishments, so that, as it is written by Isaiah, neither is his fire extinguished nor does his worm die. (Isaiah lxvi.)

Chapter III.—Of Redemption by Our Lord Jesus Christ.

1. God, therefore, who is rich in mercy, (John iii.,) being unwilling that those whom he had created should perish, sent his Son into the world, that when it was impossible for man to deliver himself he might have redemption in our Lord and Saviour through his blood, as is written by the Apostle. (Rom. iii.)

2. For God laid our iniquities upon him that he might bear our sins in his own body, nailing them to the tree. (Isaiah liii.) He, as he suffered in innocence, and satisfied for our sins, hath indeed redeemed us, and so appeased God the Father. (1 Peter ii.) But the same Father, because of his blood, acquitted us, miserable and polluted by sins, and reconciled us to himself. For Paul says truly, "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." (2 Cor. v.)

3. And though God is propitious to us freely, (Rom. iii.,) and for his name's sake, and wipes away our iniquities for his own sake, yet that he might not remit sins without any

price of sanctification, he, for the display of his righteousness, of his incomprehensible wisdom and boundless goodness, mingled righteousness with mercy, and was pleased that a price for redeeming us should be paid by the blood of his own Son, that the punishments which we sinners ought to have suffered, the same that most innocent Lamb should endure on the cross, and we might be able to borrow from his wounds the price of redemption, which we miserable could not pay, and use it for our deliverance and salvation, that while our most gracious Father pities us freely, he does not, however, pity without the intervention of the blood of his own Son, that what is here bestowed on us freely we ought to ascribe to the merit and righteousness of Christ, that whosoever glories may glory in the Lord our Redeemer and Saviour. (Jer. ix.; 1 Cor. i.)

Chapter IV.—Of Justification.

1. Now he who is redeemed by the precious blood of Christ, and to whom the merits of Christ's passion are applied, is forthwith justified, that is, finds forgiveness of his sins, is immediately acquitted from liability to eternal damnation, and raised up by the Holy Spirit, and so from being unrighteous is made righteous. For God when he justifies acts not with man only after the manner of man, merely pardoning him, forgiving his sin, and absolving his guilt, but he makes him better; a thing which men are not wont and not able to give. For he communicates to him of his Holy Spirit who purifies his heart, and by love shed abroad in his heart, incites him to seek after what is good and just, and follow out and act what is thus sought.

2. This is that true method of inherent righteousness which David longed for when he uttered the wish—"Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit in my bowels." (Psalm iv.) Of this the Apostle writes,—"Ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified;" (1 Cor. vi.;) and when he says, "That God of his own mercy has saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Spirit, whom he hath shed on us abundantly, through Jesus

Christ our Saviour, that being justified by his grace, we may be heirs according to the hope of eternal life." (Titus v.)

3. And though this righteousness, which flows from the fountain of the law of the Spirit, is far more abundant than was the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, (Matt. v.; Gal. v.,) yet in those who are endued with it, concupiscence nevertheless wars with the Spirit, so long as we live here. Hence it is that the same with their mind, indeed, serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin, and live not without sin. (1 John i.)

4. Seeing, then, that man, while he lives in this life, does not obtain the full perfection of inherent righteousness, Christ of a truth, who was made to us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption, most kindly succours us in this respect, inasmuch as he, both by the communication of his own righteousness, renders the righteousness of the man partaking of it inherent, and so augments it, that it is renewed from day to day, till it is fully perfected in the eternal home, and by the merit of his precious blood, and by the most perfect righteousness which he establishes, he obtains indulgence for man, so that what man because of his weakness could not do, is recovered and pardoned through the perfection of Christ. (Aug. Cont. Faust. lib. xix. c. 7.) Hence the comforting words of John,—"Little children, I write these things unto you that ye sin not; and if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins." (1 John ii.)

5. The merit of Christ, and the inherent righteousness to which we are renewed by the gift of charity, indeed concur —the inherent righteousness, that by it we may live soberly, and righteously, and godly, in this world, waiting for the blessed hope and advent of the great God and our Saviour. But the merit of Christ, that it may become the cause of our inherent righteousness, and as in many things we all offend, and because of our weakness and imperfection many things occur to disturb our minds, and urge us to despair, we breathe again in the same merit and precious blood of Jesus Christ, and find what may enable us to struggle most resolutely in hope of salvation. For in Christ Jesus the

Lord, our Redeemer and Saviour, whom the pious put on, and with whom all things are given unto them, the Apostle says that all things are most firm, and solid, and perfect to us, so that by the same we are rightly supported in a living hope. (Gal. iii.)

Chapter V.—Of the Utility and the Fruits of Justification.

1. The justified have indeed peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ. For God is appeased, is merciful and propitious to them, so that they can hope that if when they were enemies, God reconciled them to himself by the death of his Son, much more, when reconciled, will they be saved, to use the words of the Apostle, which are most full of comfort. (Rom. v.)

2. Likewise, those who are justified are adopted by God as sons, that, as Paul testifies, they are heirs of the eternal Father in heaven, and co-heirs of Christ, (Rom. viii.,) and have now right of access to that inheritance which is eternal life.

Chapter VI.—Of the means by which a Man receives Justification.

1. Although God, not by works of righteousness which man hath done, but according to his own mercy, justifies him, and that freely, (Rom. iii.,) that is, without his merit, so that if he would glory he must glory only in Christ, (1 Cor. i.,) by whose merit alone he is redeemed from guilt, and justified, yet our merciful God does not here act with men as with a block, but draws him willing, if he be an adult. For such an one receives not those benefits of Christ, unless, by the preventing grace of God, his mind and will are moved to a detestation of sin. For, seeing that sin separates between us and God, as Isaiah says, (Isa. lix.,) none can approach the throne of grace and mercy, save he who has previously been turned away from sin by repentance. Accordingly, John, when preparing the way of the Lord, said, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." (Matt. i.)

2. Farther, the same divine grace moves the mind toward

God by Christ, as this is the method of faith by which man, believing without hesitation, assents to the Holy Scriptures, and the promises which they bring. For Christ himself, after he had first required repentance, immediately requires such a faith, saying, "Since the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God approacheth, repent, and believe the gospel." (Mark i.)

3. He who thus believes and, from fear of the divine justice by which he is beneficially alarmed, has turned to consider the mercy of God, and redemption by the blood of Christ, is aroused and admonished by the grace of God, conceives trust and hope to believe against the hope of his merit, (Rom. iv.,) in the hope of the promised mercy, giving glory to God, and is thus brought to charity.

4. With such faith towards God, (Gal. iii.; Rom. iii.,) whosoever leans on the divine mercy and merit of Christ, and commits himself to the same, receives the promise of the Spirit, and is so justified by faith in God, according to Scripture, that not only is sin forgiven him, but he is also sanctified and renewed by the Holy Spirit: for that faith obtains the gift of the Holy Spirit, by whom love is shed abroad in our hearts. To whatever extent charity is added to faith and hope, to the same extent are we truly justified by inherent righteousness. For this righteousness consists of faith, hope, and charity, so that if you withdraw any one of these from this righteousness you obviously leave it maimed.

Chapter VII.—Of Charity and Good Works.

1. Charity, which is the end of the commandment and fulfilling of the law, as soon as it enters justification is fruitful, and now includes in itself the seeds of all good works. As it is prepared to bear the good fruits of righteousness, so it bears them in him who is justified at the earliest and as often as it ought, and the faculty of working is not taken from him by any impediment. Accordingly, the faith which works not by love seems not to be living but rather barren and dead, as James testifies. (James ii.) Nay, man, whatever be the degree in which he is endued with faith, if he wants charity, remains in death, as John declares, (1 John iii.,)

seeing that charity especially ought now to be a part of the eternal life which is begun in us, and is to be perfected at last in glory. For though faith and hope will cease when we shall have gone to those eternal mansions, charity will remain and enter therein, (1 Cor. xiii.,) that in respect of it we may be able to live most happily and enjoy God, who will thus be all in all, throughout the ages of eternity. Nevertheless that faith by which nominal Christians are discriminated from infidels is true, inasmuch as they assent to the Scriptures, and the things revealed by God, although it is disjoined from charity.

2. From this greatest gift of God, which the more it increases in us the more our old man is impaired, the good works which flow as from a fountain are so necessary to the salvation of every justified person, that he who does not do them continually, loses the grace of God, and, like an useless branch is cut off from Christ, and cast into the fire, as Christ himself teaches in his gospel. (John xv., Matt. vii.)

3. And though these works are such that God may exact them from us as in his own right, and the saints, though they should have done all the things commanded, ought still to acknowledge and say, that they are unprofitable servants, yet as they proceed from them to God, and are effects of the grace of God, and as God has of his own will most liberally promised reward to those working, he designs to reward them both with temporal blessings and eternal life, according to the testimony of the Apostle, who says, "Abound in every good work, knowing that your labour is not in vain in the Lord. For God is not unjust to forget your work and love which ye have shewn in his name." (1 Cor. xv.; Heb. vi.)

4. And the justified having now become as the servants of righteousness, exhibiting their members as the servants of righteousness unto sanctification, (grace co-operating,) they abound in good works; and the more they abound in them, the more increase of righteousness is added to them, that those who are righteous may become more righteous. "Fear not," saith the Scripture, "of being justified unto death." (Eccles. i.) Again, "He who is just, let him be

justified still," (Rev. xxii.,) and, let him who is fruitful in Christ, be purged by the heavenly Father, to produce more abundant fruit, as Christ himself teaches. (John xv.) This is that justification by works of which James, the brother of the Lord, speaks. (James ii.)

5. As to what remains, although the works commanded by God as necessary to salvation, are especially to be urged according to the words of Christ, "If thou wouldest enter into life keep the commandments," (Matt. xix.,) those things which, superadded to the precepts, are either piously or honestly received, are themselves also to be recommended, that we may not be at variance with the Holy Spirit, who recommends many of these in the Holy Scriptures. Were it otherwise, "to leave and sell all, and follow the Lord," "to preserve virginity or continence," would not be good and useful. Nay, David, when he danced before the ark, might justly have been laughed at by Michal, (2 Kings vi.,) and Paul would in vain have remitted his salary to those to whom he had preached the word. (1 Cor. ix.)

6. In short, works of supererogation, which are done above what is commanded, (to use the expression of Chrysostom,) must be distinguished from those which are done against it. These Christ himself condemns as the leaven of the Pharisees; those the Holy Spirit recommends in the Scripture, saying, "O Lord, accept the free-will-offering of my mouth." (Psalm cxviii.)

Chapter VIII.—Of Confidence in the Forgiveness of Sins.

1. Then care must be taken that we do not either make men too secure and confident in themselves, or drive them by anxious doubting to despair. Wherefore, since Paul says, (Gal. ii.,) that he was indeed conscious of no sin, but yet by this was not justified, man cannot believe that his sins are forgiven without a doubt of his own weakness or indisposition. But although he ought not to boast in himself, he is not to be so terrified as to doubt the promises of God, and the efficacy of the death and resurrection of Christ, and despair of obtaining the forgiveness of sins and salvation. All hope, and the assurance of all confidence, ought to be in the

precious blood of Christ, which was shed because of us and our salvation. In him alone we both can with certainty, and we ought, to breathe and confide, having the confirmation of the Holy Spirit, who bears witness with our spirit that we are the children of God.

Chapter IX.—Of the Church.

1. It now seems proper to treat of the Church, which is the whole body of the faithful in Christ, unto which the Holy Spirit so gathers and joins regenerate men and Christians, that they are one house, one body by one baptism and one faith, which, as Paul testifies, is one in all Christians. Wherefore it is necessary that the life of Christians, in order to attain to the perfect end at which the Church aims, should be good and pious. Let no man, however, persuade himself that any probity of life will avail him, unless he has joined and accommodated himself to the unity and communion of believers. Let the Church, then, be the house of the living God, and that body of which Christ is the head; "for we being many are one body in Christ," says Paul. (Eph. v.)

2. For this Church our Lord Jesus Christ gave himself, that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of the water of life in the word, that he might exhibit it a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it might be holy and immaculate. (Eph. v.)

3. And seeing that the Church alone is that door and one body, it is certain that Christ sanctifies and cherishes it alone by his Spirit, so that out of it he gives the blessings of his grace to none. Whoso, therefore, is not in the communion of this body, is no more quickened by the Holy Spirit unto eternal salvation, than any natural member cut off and torn away from its body is quickened unto natural life, because it is no longer invigorated by the vital Spirit flowing from its one head. Wherefore, we must believe that no one out of the Christian Church and its spiritual communion can obtain eternal life.

4. The nature of this communion is, that as the Spirit of Christ descends from him, as Head, into his own body, that

is, permeates the Church and all her members, each member receives as much from him as suffices it for salvation; and what good falls to each, the same he lends to all, and so provides for the whole body. For, as the Apostle says, (Eph. iv.,) the members grow up in love in all things in him who is the Head, even Christ, from whom the whole body compacted and connected by every joint of supply, according to the operation of each member, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love. In such a connection and society of men, the connection is the strongest when the members are solicitous for each other; and whether one member suffers, all the members suffer with it, or one member rejoices, all the members rejoice with it. (2 Cor. xii.)

5. And although the Church, as consisting of such members as live in love, is composed of saints only, and so far spiritual and invisible, yet it is also sensible, as Christ himself demonstrates, saying, "Tell the Church." (Matt. xviii.) To this same Church belong the bishops, who rule the people whom Christ has purchased with his own blood. Other ministers also belong to it. For God gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers. (Eph. iv.)

6. To this same Church belongs the word of God, which flows into the ear; belong the sacraments; belong the keys of binding and losing; belongs the power of coercing by excommunication; belongs calling to ecclesiastical offices; belongs, in fine, the right of making Canons.

7. Those things which pertain to the sensible and external part of the Church ought to be subservient to the perfecting of saints, to the work of the ministry, to the edification of the body of Christ. Now, in the Church, not only saints, but also bad men as its members, though withered, are found: whence Christ likens it at one time to a net cast into the sea, and inclosing good and bad fishes; at another, to a sown field producing at once good corn and tares. For those who have been made members of the Church by baptism often relapse into sin, and make themselves the servants of sin, and liable to eternal damnation. And although they lose the grace of the communion of saints, and

of the spiritual Church, they nevertheless remain in the external society of Christians, and in the Church; they hear the word of God, and take the sacraments, and have other sensible things likewise in common with the Church, unless they are cut off, either by just excommunication, or by schism, or by heresy, or by defection from the Christian faith.

8. Miserable indeed is the condition of those who languish under mortal sin, and who, removed from spiritual communion, live in peril of eternal damnation; but still, as they may hear the word and use the sacraments usefully as instruments of Divine grace, they may be more easily restored to the communion of the Church, especially as, even in the external Church, the Holy Spirit worketh salvation by the word of God and the Sacraments.

9. But schismatics, heretics, and those revolting from the Christian faith, as they are separated not only from the spiritual, but also from the external society of the Church, as long as they are in this calamitous state, have no means of being assisted and recovered; nay, like members cut off from the whole body, they putrefy to their own destruction, unworthy to remain in any part of the body of Christ, whose unity they so shamefully rend and lacerate. Hence the words of the Apostle: "A heretic, after the first and second admonition, avoid, knowing that he who is of this description is subverted and fails, seeing he is condemned by his own judgment." (Tit. iii.)

Chapter X.—Of the Marks and Signs of the True Church.

1. And since there are various bodies of men which associate together, it is of importance to know the marks and signs by which the Church is distinguished from other human societies, especially seeing that those schismatics and heretics who fall off from the true Church constitute bodies of their own, and hesitate not to annex to them the name and authority of the Church; and others of them say that Christ is elsewhere: of these Christ himself admonishes us to beware. (Matt. xxiv.)

2. The signs of the true Church, then, that is, of that great house, in which are not only vessels of gold and silver,

but also of wood and of clay, and some to honour and some to dishonour, are sound doctrine and the right use of the Sacraments, by which the Church is disjoined from meetings of Jews and Gentiles, both of whom want both sound doctrine and the Sacraments of the New Testament.

3. The third sign is unity, which is maintained by the bond of love and peace, and so joins the members of the Church together, that they not only are of the same sentiments which the uniform consent of the saints, from the days of the Apostles even to ours, has received and approved, but speak the same thing as the Apostle exhorts: (1 Cor. i.) "I beseech you, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be perfect in the same feeling and sentiments."

4. The fourth sign of the true Church is, that it is catholic and universal; that is, diffused through all times and places, and, through means of the Apostles and their successors, continued even to us, being propagated by succession even to the ends of the earth, according to the promises of God: "Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the utmost ends of the earth for thy possession." (Psalm ii.; Heb. i.) Again, "Many will come unto me from the east and from the west, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. viii.) Again, "And you will be witnesses to me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the ends of the earth." (Acts i.) Again, "And I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Comforter, to abide with you for ever, the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive." (John xiv.)

5. These two signs distinguish the Church from flocks of schismatics and heretics who break the bond of peace, and to their own destruction deprive themselves of Catholic union, while they prefer their own party to the whole universal Church.

Chapter XI.—Of the Authority and Power of the Church.

1. Although the Scripture, as Christ says, cannot be broken, and is therefore immovable, and greater than all human authority, still the authority of distinguishing between true and spurious Scriptures belonged to the Church. Hence is that Canon of Scripture which distinguished the genuine from the false writings which were obtruded under the name of the disciples and apostles of the Lord.

2. And as the Church always had power and authority in this matter, so had it also of interpreting, and so of exploring and extracting, doctrines from the same Scriptures, as she never is without the Holy Spirit to lead her into all truth, as Christ himself hath promised. Hence the words of Peter, "No prophecy of Scripture is of self-interpretation; but holy men of God spake as they were inspired by the Holy Spirit." And this power of interpreting is most necessary in those matters which are difficult to be understood, as the thing itself teaches. (John xiv.; 2 Pet. i.)

3. The Church, besides, has traditions brought down from Christ and his Apostles by the hands of the Bishops, even to our own times. He who tears them up denies that she is the pillar and ground of the truth. Of this class are the baptism of infants, &c.

4. It is likewise clear that the power of restraining and excommunicating belongs to the Church, and that by the appointment of Christ, as to the power of binding. Conformable to this is the expression of the Apostle, "Take away the evil thing from among you," Matt. xvi.; 1 Cor. v.

5. She has also the power of giving judgment. For when the right of restraining is possessed, the power of deciding cannot be wanting.

6. And if doubtful questions arise in the Church, she has the power of judging of the same, and decreeing, and that by a Council, and what this Council lawfully assembled in the Holy Spirit decrees, the Holy Spirit himself seems to decree, according to the words of the Council of Jerusalem: "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us." (Acts xv.)

Therefore, that the authority of Councils is most salutary no man ought to doubt.

7. And as is perceived from the same Council of Jerusalem, the Church has also power to frame Canons, and that for the advantage of the Church, whose power is all for edification and not for destruction.

Chapter XII.—Of the Ministers of the Church.

1. The Church has a divinely delivered doctrine which is to be taught to the people. She has also external sacred rites which are to be handled and explained piously and salubriously for the advantage of Christians: hence, on this account, the ministers who perform the necessary offices for these purposes neither can nor ought to be wanting to the Church. And, indeed, these offices are not common to all Christians, but God himself from the beginning gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edification of the body of Christ.

2. Accordingly, in the time of the Apostles, power to perform the offices of the Church was given, not to all but to certain persons only, and those set apart for the purpose. For when Barnabas, Lucius, Manaen, and Saul were at Antioch, while they were ministering to the Lord, (as Luke says in the Acts of the Apostles,) and fasting, the Holy Spirit said unto them, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work to which I have called them." (Acts xiii.) We must be careful, therefore, not to confound the spiritual priesthood common to all Christians, whom the Holy Spirit hath anointed, with this outward and ministerial priesthood which belongs not to all, but to those only who have been called and duly ordained to it. This could not happen without grievous and pernicious perturbation and calamity to the Churches.

Chapter XIII.—Of the Supreme Pontiff and Bishops.

1. And that the Church which belongs to one head, that is, is the one body of Christ, ought to be more easily kept in

unity, though she has many bishops to rule her people whom Christ has purchased with his own precious blood, and that by divine law, yet for the removal of schism she has one Supreme Pontiff to preside over all the others with plenitude of power, and that in respect of the prerogative granted to Peter. How useful this is to avert schisms from the Church is sufficiently evident to those who are not ignorant, that from the contempt of this Supreme Pontiff schisms generally arose, as Cyprian writes, and the thing itself testifies.

2. The Supreme Pontiff, therefore, who holds the chair of Peter, with the right with which Peter received it from Christ, when he said, "Feed my sheep," (John xxi.,) both governs the whole Church and ought to govern.

3. This his power, however, he ought to use, not for destruction, but for edification. Christ, in giving this plenitude of power to Peter and his successors, seems not to have withdrawn part of that care from the other bishops, but to have wished them to be, by divine right, true bishops of their churches and dioceses. Christian men ought to obey both the Supreme Pontiff and their individual bishops also, according to the words of the Apostle, "Obey them who are set over you, who watch for your souls." (Heb. xiii.)

Chapter XIV.—Of the Sacraments in general.

1. The Sacraments were instituted by divine authority, chiefly for two reasons. The one is that they might be certain marks and signs of that great assembly—the Church. For men cannot be gathered under a name unless they are bound together by some community of signs or sacraments. Wherefore our Lord Jesus Christ bound together the society of his new people by Sacraments very few in number, most easy of observance, most excellent in meaning, viz., Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony.

2. The other reason is, that they may not only signify but also sanctify and confer the invisible grace of God, not by the proper virtue of external things, or the merit of the minister, but of the Lord appointing and working secretly. Wherefore, although it becomes a minister of the Sacraments

to be a good man, yet a bad man also may dispense them usefully.

Chapter XV.—Of Baptism.

1. And first, indeed, as it is necessary to man for salvation, that he be Regenerated into a new creature, seeing that otherwise he is by nature a child of wrath, Christ himself instituted the Sacrament of Baptism, to be the laver of that Regeneration, which is not less necessary to the new and spiritual life than carnal nativity is to the natural life. Nor can any one obtain salvation, unless he be born again of water and of the Spirit, as Christ himself declares. (John iii.)

2. This Sacrament, therefore, washes, sanctifies, justifies us: this Sacrament makes us obtain the remission of our sins, original and actual. In short, this Sacrament is altogether of such a nature, and so salutary, that he who is initiated by it puts on Christ, as Paul writes. (Gal. iii.)

3. This Sacrament consists of the word of God, and water. For as soon as the word is added to the element, it becomes a Sacrament, by the laver of which we are regenerated and cleansed from all sin. Wherefore, when we see the water washing the body outwardly, let us reflect that the Spirit, whom we see not, is doing more inwardly.

4. With regard to the form of words, without which the mystery cannot be completed, Christ delivered it to the Apostles, when he enjoined them to baptize in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. On this command, as often as Baptism is conferred, both the faith of the recipient, if he is adult, and in the case of infants, the faith both of those engaging and confessing for them, and of the whole Church, and the word of the officiating Minister, lean, inasmuch as he says, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit." (Matt. xxviii. 19.)

5. To us, indeed, it seems that it tends very greatly to excite the faith and promote the comfort of adults, that they understand that those who are baptized in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, are now consecrated and sanctified by the power, energy, and might of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and wholly con-

secrated to God, and made the peculiar property of God, who is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, to whose guardianship they now pass, giving themselves to God in an eternal covenant, by which they renounce the devil and his works, and promise to be soldiers of God.

6. In regard to the office of Baptism, though it belongs chiefly to Priests, yet a Layman may rightly and usefully baptize, in case of necessity: and if a heretic should baptize, provided he use the due matter, form, and intention, the Sacrament is not to be repeated, seeing the same depends not on the dignity of the Minister, but on the truth of the divine word, and the energy of the Holy Spirit.

7. But though Baptism takes away all our defilements, according to the Scripture, it does not, however, take away all the languor of vitiated nature, as we also observed above, for it leaves concupiscence, inclining to evil, though the guilt be removed. This concupiscence ceases not to war against the good spirit in man, so long as we live on this earth.

8. Herein, however, the efficacy of Baptism fails us not, in that it not only has at once taken away the guilt of every sin, but in opposition to the concupiscence still adhering to us, and stirring up wars of desire, it confirms our strength, through the Holy Spirit, by whom we are so fortified against all the power of concupiscence, that we are able to resist it and prevail over it, the Apostle admonishing us, "Walk in the Spirit, and you will not fulfil the desires of the flesh." (Gal. v. 16.) Thus far of Baptism.

Chapter XVI.—Of Confirmation.

1. And as it is necessary for the corporeal life of man, not only to be born and be, but also to grow and be nourished, so it is necessary to him for salvation that he be not only Regenerated, but also confirmed and increased in good, by the energy of the Holy Spirit; for which purpose was instituted one of the most useful Sacraments, viz., Confirmation, which the Apostles celebrated when they laid hands on the Samaritans, with beneficial efficacy, as is written in the Acts of the Apostles. (Acts viii.) What the Apostles then did they did in the name of Christ, and in introducing this mystery

they seem to have acted for Christ, just as in the other parts of their office. This mystery rests on the promises of Christ concerning the grace of the Holy Spirit, and the sending of him,—"I will send the promise of the Father unto you." (Luke xxiv. 49.) Again, "But the Spirit, the Comforter, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things." (John xvi. 26.)

2. And although, at the beginning, the Sacrament of Confirmation was only celebrated by the laying on of hands, yet the Church, immediately subsequent to the days of the Apostles, in accordance with their traditions, with the view of indicating the internal unction of the Holy Spirit, by an external sign, added chrism to the rite, together with the sign of the holy cross, which custom, and it is a very ancient one, the Catholic Church ceases not to approve. And she believes that those of his servants whom God has regenerated by water and the Spirit, the same are so sealed by this mystery, that they receive the Spirit with the seven eyes,—the holy Comforter from heaven, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge, and godliness, and fear. When the Catholic Church, who is the best interpreter of the mysteries of God, believes these things, and attests them in the administration of the Sacrament, he who thinks differently denies her to be the pillar and ground of the truth.

3. The virtue of this Sacrament, therefore, is, that those who are confirmed by it receive the Holy Spirit, by which they may be able to walk and persevere in the ways of salvation, and happily resist the temptations and snares of the devil, the world, and the flesh.

4. But as most of those who are baptized are infants, and do not by themselves give forth a profession of faith, it will be proper that when as adults now sufficiently instructed in the Christian religion, they come to receive the Sacrament of Confirmation, they with their own mouths also profess faith in Christ and obedience to the Church, and fasting, and having confessed, be initiated in this sacred mystery, as was ordained by the Council of Aurelium. We do not, however, think that children are to be kept back from this Sacrament,

seeing Christ himself hesitated not to lay his hands on them, (Matt. xix. 13-15,) for we do not here lay down a law to the Churches.

5. Let the Minister of this Sacrament, however, be a Bishop. This is approved by the consent of the whole Catholic Church and the practice of the Apostles.

Chapter XVII.—Of the Sacrament of Penance.

1. And since the Regenerate often fall into grievous crimes, Christ instituted the Sacrament of Penance, which, after Baptism, is as it were our second plank in shipwreck. For this use he gave the key of loosing, saying: "Receive the Holy Spirit; whose sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them." (John xx. 22, 23.) For so soon as a sinner truly repents of his sin, and draws near with confidence to the throne of mercy, and believes that what Christ promised is received by this Sacrament, it is done to him as he believes, nor is the thing promised wanting to this Sacrament. For like other Sacraments, this, too, has the power of sanctifying. This Sacrament consists in the absolution of the Priest, which is founded on the institution and words of Christ, who for this purpose delegates his power to Priests, saying, "As the Father hath sent me, so send I you. Receive the Holy Spirit; whose sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them." (John xx. 21, 23.)

2. But as the Priest has authority not only to remit, but also to bind, both having been at the same time divinely delivered, he seems to receive the power of judging in so far as he receives this power of both keys: nor can he exercise it unless he understands whether he ought to remit or to retain. But such judgment can only be derived from the confession of the mouth and the enumeration of sins. For seeing that most of men's faults are committed without a witness, while secret crimes also beset and wound the soul, and are sometimes more grievous and perilous than those that are manifest, the priest is not able to judge of them truly unless he who has committed them review and confess them, and himself open, as it were, his own wounds.

3. Wherefore as the remedy of Penance has been pointed out as a cure for the faults of men, the Confession also of the

penitent, with an enumeration of his sins, seems recommended; and as the Sacrament of Penance is to be proved to the Christian people to be salutary and necessary, so also ought the Confession and enumeration of sins, which, while it is not to be too much relaxed, is not, on the other hand, to be made too stringent. For who understands his faults? (Psalm xix. 12.) Wherefore the sins are to be enumerated which come into the mind of one reflecting and examining himself, not too anxiously indeed, but carefully. Those which do not come into the mind are rightly included in a general Confession, and are remitted no less than if they had been individually confessed. And as pardon is here sought from Absolution, the burden imposed by Confession is not so great as the comfort which Absolution gives to him who believes it.

4. Then although that Satisfaction which expiates the guilt and eternal punishment is to be attributed to Christ alone, the satisfaction which consists in the fruits of Penitence, especially fasting, alms, and prayer, whether undertaken of ourselves, or enjoined by the clergy and dispensers of the sacraments, if performed in faith and charity, cuts off the causes of sin, and cures the remains of sin, and either takes away or mitigates the temporal punishment, and, in fine, operates as an example.

5. But to return to the Absolution of the Priests, in which the power of the Sacrament of Penance consists. The form and the words ought to be such that he who confesses may be able to hear and understand that his sins are forgiven by the benefit, merit, and power of Christ, according to the institution and the words, "Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them." (John xx. 23.) For to use the words of Ambrose, "The office is God's, though the ministry is the Priest's."

Chapter XVIII.—Of the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

1. They who have been brought alive again in the Lord by the Sacrament of Penance, must also be nourished and grow in spiritual good. Christ, therefore, instituted the Sacrament of the Eucharist under the visible species of bread and wine, which affords us the true body and blood of Christ,

and by this spiritual food unites us to himself, as to the head and members of his body, that thereby we may be nourished with all good, and with the saints, and in their communion grow up in charity. "For we being many are one bread and one body, for all of us are partakers of that one bread," says Paul. (1 Cor. x. 17.)

2. The form of this Sacrament are those solemn words which Christ himself uttered, "This is my body:" and again, "For this is the cup of my blood," &c. (Matt. xxvi. 26, 27.)

3. But if we give as much as we ought to Christ and his word, there is no doubt that as soon as these words are added to the bread and the wine, the bread and wine become the true body and true blood of Christ, so that the substance of bread and wine is transmuted into the true body and blood of Christ. He who denies this calls the omnipotence of Christ in question, and charges Christ himself with foolishness.

4. Hence it is the more necessary to take heed that this Sacrament be not received unworthily. For it is written, "He that eateth or drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the Lord's body. For this reason many among you are weak and imbecile, and many sleep." (1 Cor. xi. 29, 30.) But that Sacrament is unworthily received by whosoever thinks of it otherwise than he ought, or does not truly repent. For, as Augustine says: "Let him who wishes to receive life change his life; for if he change not his life, he will receive life for judgment, and he is more corrupted by it than cured, more killed than made alive." Wherefore the custom of the Church is to be approved, which does not bring a man to the Sacrament of the Eucharist before the Sacrament of Penance has cleansed him.

5. The Eucharist has the power of strengthening in spiritual good, for which assuredly there is no room, unless the purging away of sins has preceded. Herein we ought to imitate good physicians, who do not give things which can strengthen and confirm before they have expelled the bad humours from the body; unless they have done this they do no good to the patient, but rather hurt him. Now, the greater the caution to be used not to take unworthily,

the more the consolation received by those who take worthily and piously, and consider that they are eating the bread which cometh down from heaven and giveth life to the world, and receiving from it true spiritual strength against all evils.

Chapter XIX.—Of Sacred Unction.

1. The Sacraments which we have already explained undoubtedly confer great and multiplied benefits on the human race. They either regenerate men when languishing under our old carnal nature, or confirm them when regenerated in the grace which they have received, or restore them, when they have lapsed, into the grace from which they have fallen, or unite them when restored more firmly to Christ; for which salutary purpose the grace of Christ is not wanting in the Sacraments, but is rather given to men through those Sacraments as instruments. Although the utility of the Sacraments is thus most extensive throughout life, yet, as a man may, when he is sick, long for peculiar succour, which in this his hour of greatest danger may either relieve his body or fortify his soul against the fiery darts of Satan, Sacred Unction was instituted, with the addition of the prayers of the Church. This Unction was first practised by the Apostles, who, being sent by their Lord on a mission to preach the gospel, cast out devils, and anointed many sick with oil, and healed them. (Mark vi. 13.) This Unction was sacramental and mystical, not medicinal or corporal, and during the early years of the gospel was followed by external soundness of body as a kind of sign of internal healing, just as in the other Sacraments for the commendation and confirmation of a still infant faith, internal virtue was demonstrated by external and sensible signs and miracles. But now an adult and confirmed faith requires not the signs which are given to the weak.

2. The mode in which this mystical and salutary Unction behoves to be administered was promulgated by the Apostle James: "Is any man sick among you? let him bring in the Presbyters of the Church that they may pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the

prayer of faith will save the sick, and the Lord will give him relief," &c. (James vi. 14, 15.)

3. In how high estimation ought the testimony of this brother of the Lord to be in the Church? We say testimony, but it is rather a proclamation which, when the Apostle and ambassador of Christ made it, Christ undoubtedly ratified as if he had made it himself. He, therefore, who despises this Sacrament, seems to despise Christ himself, and to spurn the grace which he here, in a manner, stretches forth to us by means of Sacred Unction: And this is the more perilous, the greater the danger to which the sick man is exposed, in regard not only to his body but also to his soul, danger into which he is brought by the powers of darkness, inasmuch as at the last moments of life they, as it were, set all their engines at work to extinguish the salvation of the man, endeavouring to break his courage by incredible terrors, and drive him to despair.

4. The Apostle James insinuates that this Sacred Unction is to be administered only to the sick, and this the other Apostles observed; not, however, in all, but only in dangerous sicknesses, and when a fatal termination is feared is this mystical Unction to be practised.

Chapter XX.—Of the Sacrament of Orders.

1. In regard to the Ministers of the Church, the greater they are the more do they need the gift and grace of God; for although all Christians are Priests, inasmuch as they can offer spiritual sacrifices to God, and profitably call upon his name in every place, all, however, are not Ministers of the Church; but, from the very origin of the Church, some were set apart for the ministry of the Church to perform these offices; and God made a distinction between them, that the same individuals might not discharge all offices, nor confusion be produced by a promiscuous arrangement; for God is not the author of confusion. (1 Cor. xiv.) The Sacrament of Orders was therefore instituted with the sign of the laying on of hands and other rites suitable to the Sacrament, by which those who might be consecrated might receive grace for the offices of the Church, and thereby be ren-

dered fit, able, and apt to administer these offices. Hence the exhortation of the Apostle to Timothy, "Do not neglect the grace which is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of hands by the presbytery." (1 Tim. iv. 14.)

2. This Sacrament of Orders is founded on the words of Christ, "As the Father hath sent me, so send I you." (John xx. 21.) "Receive the Holy Spirit: whose sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them." (John xx. 23; Mark xvi. 15, 16.) "Go into the world and preach the gospel to every creature: go and teach all nations, baptizing them." (Matt. xxviii. 19.) "This do in remembrance of me." (Luke xxii. 20.) To those, therefore, on whom, in the perpetual succession of the Church, Bishops lay their hands, that they may be inducted into Orders, they give the power of executing their office—a power which is twofold, viz., that of Orders and that of Jurisdiction. Under the one falls the ministry of the divine word, the administration of the Sacraments, and the ordering of the Churches for edification; under the other falls the power of Excommunicating and of Absolving Penitents. The Orders which the Catholic Church recognises are these seven—Presbyters, Deacons, Sub-deacons, Accolytes, Readers, Exorcists, Ostiarii, to whom distinct offices, and those either necessary or useful to the Churches, ought to be assigned; so that it is very obvious that he deserves ill of the Christian Church who either abolishes or spurns these Orders.

Chapter XXI.—Of the Sacrament of Matrimony.

1. God instituted Marriage in Paradise, that thus a male and female might be united as perpetual and undivided companions for life, according to the words of the Lord, "Wherefore, a man shall leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife, and they shall be twain in one flesh." (Matt. xix. 5, 6.)

2. But although Marriage was instituted for this strict companionship, yet, under the law of the Fathers, marriages had degenerated from their first institution in two ways, viz., one man married several wives, and he repudiated her

whom he had married by giving her a writing of divorce. The former was permitted by the dispensation of God, and was subservient to a mystery of after-times, viz., to intimate, by the several wives of one husband, that Christ would collect a Church to himself from the multitude of the Gentiles as well as from the Synagogue, that he would adopt her as his Spouse, and that, by the fecundity of several wives, they would serve Christ the Saviour, who was to spring from the same seed.

3. The divorce Moses permitted to the people, because of the hardness of their hearts, thinking it a lesser evil that a wife hated by her husband should be dismissed than slain, to open up a way for a new marriage by her murder. (Deut. xxiv. 1-4; Matt. xix. 8.)

4. But after the fulness of divine grace arrived, as Christ restored other things which were either in heaven or on the earth, so he also restored Marriage. Hence he says, "He who made man at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh. Wherefore, they are now no longer two, but one flesh. Wherefore, whom God hath joined, let no man put asunder." And a little after, he says, "Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, allowed you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so. Wherefore, whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, and marry another, committeth adultery." (Matt. xix. 8, 9; Mark x. 5-9.) This the Apostle interprets, when he says, "Those who are joined in marriage I command, yet not I, but the Lord, that the wife depart not from her husband; but if she have departed, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband." (1 Cor. vii. 10, 11.)

5. The special conditions of Christian Marriage, therefore, are proved by clear passages of holy writ to be these: The one is, that Marriage be that of two persons only in the union of one man with a woman. "They shall be twain," says he, "in one flesh." Nor is it lawful for those thus joined to defraud one another, by giving up their persons to some third party, the Apostle prohibiting this, and

saying, "The woman has not the power of her own body, but the man: in like manner, the man has not power over his own body, but the woman." (1 Cor. vii. 4.) The other condition is, that the bond of Marriage, once formed between two, is no more dissolved by any divorce, but only by the death of either. For in regard to the intimation by Christ, that the wife may be put away for fornication, this makes the spouses cease to live together at bed and board, but does not dissolve the bond of marriage; so that he commits adultery who marries one thus put away, just as he does who has intercourse with another man's wife.

6. Since Christ then made Marriage both by his own grace, and bound it, as it were, with a faster chain, as Christ is the one spouse of one Church, and that by an indissoluble tie, so a man is the one husband of one wife, and that by perpetual union, in like manner as Christ is perpetually joined with his spouse the Church. Wherefore, Marriage is not only the union of male and female, but is also a Sacrament, because of the grace of Christ, which is never wanting to it, in order that a man may be able to love his wife just as Christ loved the Church, to cultivate an undivided connection with her, and be contented with her for ever. Nor is he to divorce her against her will, except for the causes which are explained by Divine law, (*jure divino.*)

7. And since God cherishes Marriage by his grace, and also approves when spouses contract marriage together, a strong ground is given to hope that their intercourse, as it is good in itself, will also be agreeable to God. And though marriage ought chiefly to be contracted for the sake of procreating offspring, yet he who contracts it even for the sake of avoiding fornication sins not. "For let every man have his own wife because of fornication," says Paul. (1 Cor. vii. 2.)

The virtue of this Sacrament then, is, that spouses may understand, that having been united not by human but by Divine authority, they have received grace by which their lawful intercourse is not imputed as a fault: by which also a Christian husband sanctifies a heathen wife who is willing to remain with him, and procreates children who are holy, *i.e.*, dedicated to God—by which, in fine, he maintains per-

petual fidelity to his wife, so that they are twain in one flesh, and by which the believing wife is saved in child-bearing, if she have remained in faith and love and sanctification, with soberness. (1 Tim. ii. 15.) Marriage, therefore, is honourable, and in it the bed may be undefiled.

8. The Manichees, Tatians, and Encratites, being ignorant of this, hesitated not to censure Marriage. This accursed temerity of theirs, produced by the doctrine of demons, the Apostle Paul condemns. (1 Tim. iv. 3.)

9. And since the bond of Matrimony is altogether such, it has such power in uniting that there is no bond of human conjunction which is more stringent. This when Adam recognised in Paradise he spoke thus of the woman whom God had formed out of a rib of his body, "This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh." "Wherefore a man shall leave his father and his mother, and cleave to his wife, and they shall be twain in one flesh." (Gen. ii. 23; Matt. xix. 5.)

10. Wherefore, as the father's power (*patria potestas*) justly yields to this union between the spouses, they are not to be listened to who insist at this time that Marriage or contracted espousals are dissolved and nullified, if the consent of the parents does not follow. We here derogate not from the obedience which children owe to their parents, but we are unwilling that parents abuse their power in impeding or dissolving marriages. Yet as we think it a comely thing for children not to contract without the advice and consent of parents, preachers ought carefully to admonish them of this their duty.

11. Whether parents ought to be permitted in this case to punish the disobedience of children by withholding, or at least diminishing the dowry, or by any other means, is a matter which we think should be left to ordinary authority.

Chapter XXII.—Of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

1. As the law of nature introduced Religion, without which no nation exists, so it also introduced Ceremonies, without which religion cannot and is not wont to be maintained. But among ceremonies external Oblation has been observed as the chief by all nations of all ages. For though, as Cy-

prian testifies, (Serm. de Circumcis.,) "they shuddered at Circumcision as cruel and unnatural, they did not in like manner repudiate the other sacrifices, but in many things following the law of nature, retained instruments of expiation, and persisted in immolating victims, and burning the fat, and pouring out vows and prayers with libations before God, worship being implanted in men by nature herself, and divinely purified in the minds of all." All nations have held it as a common principle, fixed in the minds of all, that by external Oblations an effect is produced on God. On this they have been generally agreed.

2. For no man ever thought of making an external Oblation without either knowing, or thinking, or feigning that there is a God. The antiquity of this worship is proved by the sacrifices of the two brothers, Cain and Abel, the former of whom, as well as his gifts, God reprobated by turning away from them, while he looked appeased on the younger's oblation. (August. de Civit. Dei, lib. 10. c. 6.)

3. This rite of Sacrifice God, as willing all men to be saved, divinely implanted in their minds. For when, because of one man's sin the whole human race had become obnoxious to the wrath and just condemnation of God, and condemnation so much the greater and more perilous hung over them, the more they were provoking the just anger of God, by accumulating sins upon sins: God unwilling that those whom he had formed should perish, destined to the human race a Mediator and Reconciler, who might reconcile us with our Creator, and appease his just anger by a singular Oblation of Sacrifice. God, therefore, sent his own well-beloved Son, clothed with our flesh into the world, who, taking our sins upon him, bore them in his own body on the Cross, and, giving himself as a victim for us, having once entered into the holies by his own blood, procured eternal redemption. (Heb. ix.)

4. The Father, softened by the odour of this most precious victim, laid aside his anger, and acquitted, justified, and reconciled to himself men formerly immersed in sin, impure, unrighteous, liable to damnation, but now washed by the blood of his Son. (1 Cor. vi.)

5. The virtue and efficacy of this one Oblation serving not only for that time at which Christ in the flesh offered himself as a victim, but embracing all the ages of the world, and all the individuals among men who have ever been, or are ever to be, sufficed to efface their sins. For verily, "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself;" (2 Cor. v. 19;) and, "Behold the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world!" (John i. 29;) and, "He is a propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world," (1 John ii. 2.) The world is not of one time, but comprehends the men of all ages. Hence in the Apocalypse, (Rev. xiii. 8,) Christ is called "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," inasmuch as his blood cleansed the faults of all ages, from the very commencement of the world.

6. Of this Oblation, which sufficed alone for the reconciliation of the whole human race, Paul says, "By one oblation he perfected for ever those that are sanctified;" (Heb. x.;) and, "It pleased the Father that in him all fulness should dwell, and that by him all things should be reconciled unto himself, pacifying them by the blood of his Cross, whether they be things on earth or things in heaven;" (Col. i. 19, 20;) and, "It pleased him to renew all things in Christ, which are in heaven and in earth, even in him." (Eph. i. 10.) And in Isaiah it is said, "I have trodden the wine-press alone;" and, "By whose stripes we are healed." (Isaiah lxiii. 3; liii. 5.)

7. Of this so efficacious Oblation which merited the salvation of all men most fully, most sufficiently, and most perfectly, that all men might partake and appropriate to themselves the fruit, God, from the beginning of the world, under the law of nature, by a divine inspiration in the minds of men, suggested the rite of Sacrifice, and afterwards in giving the law, appointed divers Sacrifices.

8. The use of all of these was, not by themselves to reconcile men to God and merit salvation, but that by these external Sacrifices, the attention of men might be ever and anon awakened to the coming Sacrifice in which God had promised redemption to all, their faith might be confirmed, and the fruit of it applied to those believing and hoping in

the virtue of the coming Sacrifice; and that as often as those Sacrifices were performed, men might remember, with grateful minds, both the other benefits which they were continually receiving from the benignity of God and the salvation to be received through a promised Reconciler.

9. Hence, neither under the law of nature, nor under the law of Moses, was any Sacrifice of itself pleasing to God, who often protested that he had no need of those which were offered: "Were I hungry I would not tell thee: the world is mine, and the fulness thereof: Shall I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats?" (Psalm l. 13.) But inasmuch as those visible sacrifices were Sacraments of the invisible and future Sacrifice, when any one offered them in faith in the Reconciler promised by God, employing external sacrifice to shew his faith in a coming Christ, and to transfer to himself the benefit of that saving Sacrifice which he had already conceived by faith, and waited for with firm hope, and to declare heartfelt gratitude to God for those great benefits, those Sacrifices, however agreeable to God and salutary to the offerer, had nothing of their own, but derived all from the virtue of the future Sacrifice which they applied to him who offered them in faith.

10. And that the nature of Sacrifices may be distinctly understood, there is only one meritorious Sacrifice, whose efficacious virtue, in effacing the sins of men, has reconciled men when alienated from God, and obnoxious to his wrath and damnation, and merited redemption and eternal salvation for the whole human race, viz., that saving Sacrifice of Christ, by which offering up himself on the Cross, as a victim for the sins of men, "he perfected for ever those who are sanctified." (Heb. x. 14.)

11. The merit of this Sacrifice receives no increase, because it is perfect, and is not exhausted or diminished, because it is eternal. (Heb. x. 12.) Hence, too, all other sacrifices add nothing to this Sacrifice, and merit nothing of themselves, but apply the benefit of this one Oblation to believers, and serve both to awaken and retain in the minds of men the remembrance of this one Oblation, and to confirm their faith and declare their gratitude for all God's mercies.

12. There are certain applicatory Sacrifices of this nature common to all laws, and permitted indiscriminately to all men, such as "the sacrifice of an humble and contrite heart," (Psalm li. 17,) and chastisements of the flesh undergone as a means of cultivating piety, the sacrifice of the lips, of prayer, thanksgiving and praise, and the like.

13. Certain Sacrifices again, were always peculiar to some one law, and annexed to certain duties, so that others were prohibited from offering them, under great threatenings and punishments. See thirteenth chapter of 1 Kings, and twenty-sixth chapter of 2 Chronicles. Nor, as now, has any law, nor has any religion of the Gentiles, been without Sacrifices. For the three things, Law, Priesthood, and Sacrifice, (Heb. vii.,) have been bound together, and necessarily follow each other.

14. Thus, under the law of nature, righteous men instructed in the promises of God, believing on him who they knew was to be a Saviour, offered Sacrifices, and by offering them declared their faith and hope in the future salvation, and their gratitude for it, and sought assistance from the merits of that saving Sacrifice which they expected to be offered. Other nations imitating this custom from the secret inspiration implanted in their minds, sought to appease by sacrifice, not God indeed, but him whom they either thought or feigned to be God.

15. But the law given by Moses, adding to the law of nature, (not to abrogate but to improve it,) instituted external oblations to prefigure the future Sacrifice of Christ, and enable the Jews, as often as they celebrated them, both to remember the other mercies of God with grateful minds, and transfer to themselves the virtue of that future Sacrifice by believing, and hoping, and praying.

16. Christ, who had not come to destroy the law, (Matt. v. 17,) in so far as it was either natural or moral, but rather to fulfil it, on bringing into the world his new law, of which he had already given a promise by Jeremiah, (Jer. xxxi.,) that he might not leave it alone maimed or imperfect in this respect, contrary to the common custom of preceding laws, provided it at once with a peculiar Sacrifice and Priesthood; since, according to the sentiment of the Apostle, it was necessary

on the succession of a new law to provide it with a peculiar Sacrifice, (Heb. vii.,) and appoint Priests as the Ministers of the Sacrifice. (Heb. v. 1.)

17. Our Lord Jesus Christ, not to be wanting to his Church in this part of the law, which is holy, pious, and good, at The Last Supper, after he had given thanks to God, instituted the Sacrament of his body and blood, at the same time recommending a twofold use of it, viz., to be taken by believers as a salutary aliment of the soul, "Take," says he, "and eat," and to be offered in remembrance of his passion, of which offering, when delivering the ministry to the Apostles, as the Priests of the new law, he says, "This do in remembrance of me." (Matt. xxvi.; Mark xiv.; Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24.)

18. As, therefore, before the advent of Christ, God delivered to the Fathers certain Sacrifices, by which they might keep alive in their minds the thought of that great Sacrifice which they expected, establish their faith, and by the offering of sacrifice gratefully call to mind the divine mercies; so Christ commended to his Church the pure and saving Oblation of his body and blood, under the species of bread and wine, by which we might, ever and anon, renew in our minds the memory of his body offered and his blood shed for us on the cross, and transfer to ourselves the benefit of that bloody Oblation by which he perfected for ever those who are sanctified: for this is to do it in remembrance of him, *i.e.*, with grateful minds to commemorate the death of the Lord, and by the memory and merit of his passion entreat the Father to be reconciled to us.

19. This is the pure and salutary Offering commemorative of that one Sacrifice by which the salvation of all was procured, not only signifying, but, in fact, comprehending in itself the reality of those things which the offering of divers sacrifices formerly prefigured. In other words, the Sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ which was offered on the cross, is the same, not another; the lamb is the same, not another; and there is one Christ in both. But he was then offered in a bloody and suffering manner, by which offering he fully obtained forgiveness of sins and redemption for all

believers, whereas now we offer him under a mystery, and in an unbloody and unsuffering manner, not that we may for the first time procure the forgiveness of sins and the salvation of our souls, but cultivating the memory of our Lord's passion, may give thanks to God for the salvation obtained for us on the cross, and apply and appropriate to ourselves with faith and devotion the forgiveness of sins and redemption then procured.

20. This saving Victim Malachi foresaw in spirit when he says, "My will is not in you, saith the Lord of hosts, and I will not receive a gift at your hand: from the rising of the sun even to its going down, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place a pure Oblation is sacrificed and offered to my name." (Mal. i. 10, 11.) This prophecy cannot be understood of spiritual sacrifices alone, which are proper to no law, but common to all times and persons, and remained always conjoined with ancient sacrifices. But the very arrangement of the words sufficiently proves that the Prophet is speaking of a Sacrifice, which, on the ancient sacrifices being removed, was to come in their place. Wherefore, these words are rightly understood of the most sacred Sacrifice of Christ, not that by which he offered himself on the cross for the sins of the human race, (for that was not consummated among the Gentiles, nor in every place, but in Judea,) but that which the Church, collected from the nations, offers throughout the world, to commemorate our Lord's death, and transfuse its virtue into believers; and this meaning of that passage is confirmed by clear passages of the Fathers.

21. Irenaeus, (lib. 4, Contra Haer., cap. 32,)—"He received that which is of the creature of bread, and gave thanks, saying, 'This is my body.' And in like manner the cup, which is of that creature which is according to us, he confessed as his blood, and taught the new Oblation of the New Testament, which (oblation) the Church, receiving from the Apostles, offers throughout the world to God, of which (thing) Malachi, among the twelve Prophets, thus prophesied,—'From the rising of the sun, even unto its going down, my name is glorified among the Gentiles, and

in every place incense is offered to my name, and a pure sacrifice.'" (Mal. i. 11.)

22. Augustine, (Contra Adversar. Legis, lib. 1, cap. 20,)—"Let those who read know what Melchisedec brought forth when he blessed Abraham. And if they are partakers of them, they see that such a Sacrifice is now offered to God throughout the world."

23. Ambrose declares of this Sacrifice of the new law,—"Before the lamb was offered a calf was offered: now Christ is offered as enduring suffering, and offers himself as if he were a priest."

24. Chrysostom—"Do we not offer every day? We indeed offer, but in commemoration of his death, and this victim is one, not many. How is it one, and not many? Both because that one was once offered, and offered upon the holy of holies. Whereas the Sacrifice is an example of that: we always offer the same. We do not, indeed, offer one lamb now and another to-morrow, but always the same," &c.

25. Athanasius—"The Priesthood of Christ is for ever, because the Oblation, having Christ both as High Priest and Sacrifice, is daily offered by the ministers of God."

26. But that this Oblation, which Christ committed to his Church to be made in remembrance of his death, he himself first employed in the Supper, and himself offered to the Father, under the species of bread and wine, is proved by great witnesses, among whom David calling Christ a Priest after the order of Melchisedec, (Psalm cix.,) sufficiently shews that Christ, by the sacrifice of bread and wine, fulfilled the type which had previously been exhibited in the priest Melchisedec, of which thing the holy martyr Cyprian says, (Lib. 2. ep. 3,) "Which order comes from that Sacrifice, and thence descends—that Melchisedec was priest of the most high God, that he offered bread and wine, that he blessed Abraham. For who is more the priest of the most high God than our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered a sacrifice to God the Father, and offered the very thing which Melchisedec had offered, that is, bread and wine, viz., his own body and blood?" Immediately after he says, "As, therefore, in Genesis, the blessing of Abraham might be duly performed by Melchisedec,

a priest, the image of a sacrifice, constituted in bread and wine, precedes, which thing our Lord perfecting and fulfilling, offered the bread and the cup mingled with wine, and he who is fulness fulfilled the reality of the prefigured image."

27. Arnobius, speaking of Christ, says,—"He who by the mystery of bread and wine was made a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec, who alone among the priests offered bread and wine, when Abraham was returning victorious from battle."

28. Damascenus—"Melchisedec, who was Priest of the most high God, received Abraham returning from the slaughter of foreigners with bread and wine. That table prefigured this mystical table, as that priest also bore the prefigured image of Christ, the true Priest. 'Thou art,' says he, 'a Priest after the order of Melchisedec.'" Many similar testimonies are found in Jerome, (ad Evagr.,) Augustine, (De Doct. Christ., lib. 4, cap. 21,) Ambrose, (de Sacram.,) Chrysostom, and Theophylact.

29. According to these testimonies of Sacred Scripture and the Holy Fathers, the Catholic Church acknowledges two Sacrifices of Christ, the same in respect of substance, but in respect of the method and rite of offering, very different: the one bloody, on the cross; the other, by which the Priest after the order of Melchisedec himself offered to the Father, his own body and blood, instituting the perpetual Sacrifice of the new law, which he committed to his Apostles and their successors, to be done by them in remembrance of him, even to the end of the world.

30. As the mode of Offering then is different, so the use is distinct. Christ, by that bloody Sacrifice, obtained reconciliation and propitiation for the sins of the whole world, and full redemption for all. But the other Sacrifice was instituted and committed to the Church in remembrance of the bloody Sacrifice, and by it we set Christ before the Father in an unbloody and unsuffering manner; not that we may obtain forgiveness of sins and redemption anew, but that we by faith and devotion may apply to ourselves that which was merited on the cross, following the injunction of Christ, who ordered us to do this in remembrance of him—that is, that

by the memory and merit of his passion, we should pray the Father for reconciliation, for the forgiveness of sins, and the salvation of our souls, for the safety of our persons and property.

31. Hitherto it has been shewn on what grounds and testimonies the Sacrifice of the Altar rests: Now let a few things be subjoined concerning the ritual.

32. In the celebration of the Sacrifice of the Altar, at one time the praises of God, at another the faithful prayers of the people, at another thanksgivings, at another reading of the Scriptures, are intermingled—whence also it is rightly called the sacrifice of prayer, praise, and thanksgiving. In this ritual the Catholic Church imitates the example of Christ, who in the Sacrifice of the Supper poured out many prayers to his Father, for the safety of the Church which he was about to leave on earth, and at last finished the mystical Supper with hymns and thanksgiving. (Matt. xxvi. 30; Mark xiv. 26; John xvii. 1, &c.)

33. But that series of admonitions by Paul, (1 Tim. ii. 1, 2,) in which he enjoins "that, first of all, supplications, prayers, entreaties, thanksgivings, be made for all men—for kings, and all who are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and tranquil life, in all piety and chastity," the Church, according to the observation of Augustine, (Ep. 59 ad Paulinum,) observes fully and articulately, in the celebration of the Sacrifice of the altar. It makes supplications before that which is on the table of the Lord begins to be blest—prayers when it is blest and sanctified, and requests or entreaties when the people are blessed and commended to the most merciful power.

34. These things being finished, and the Sacrament received, thanksgiving concludes the whole. See Augustine's 59th Epist. to Paulinus, where you will clearly recognise the rite of celebrating the Sacrifice of the Altar, as the Church observes it in the present day.

35. But we may see this Rite received and confirmed by all the Catholics of all ages, who with great uniformity have remembered that prayers and thanksgivings were mingled in the celebration of this Sacrifice, and that the Host itself was wont to be consecrated by solemn prayer. On this sub-

ject see Chrysostom, (In Matth. Hom. 83, de Sacerdot. lib. 3;) Basil the Great, (de Spiritu Sancto, cap. 27;) Theophylact, (in cap. 14 Marc.;) Gregory, (Ep. 63 ad Joann. Episc. Syrac.;) Ambrose, (de Sacram., lib. 4, cap. 5,) who everywhere, in the books published by him, comments on the Canon which the Church now uses, almost taking the words in their order, one by one.

Chapter XXIII.—Of the Commemoration of Saints, wont to be made in the Sacrifice of the Altar, and of their Intercession there expounded, and, by the way, of the Invocation of Saints.

1. Seeing, then, that in this Sacrifice of the Altar we cultivate the remembrance of that boundless mercy by which Christ made himself a Victim for the safety and salvation of his whole mystical body, *i.e.*, all believers, and there, according to the example of our Lord, and the admonition of the Apostle, prayers are to be poured forth to God for the safety of the whole Church, and thanks to be given for all his benefits, the Church collecting all her members within herself, makes mention of those also, who, divested of this mortal life, are living with the Lord. And, first of all, embracing the Saints beloved of God, with grateful veneration, she gives thanks to God for those who, when they were weak by nature, he so strengthened by the gift of his grace, that they overcame the vices of the flesh, and striving, not in their own strength, but that of God, by fighting manfully against death, the devil, and sin, obtained from the just Judge a crown of righteousness. Of the antiquity, and throughout the Church universally diffused custom, of giving thanks for the Saints, see Dionysius the Areopagite, Cyprian, (lib. 8, epist. 6, lib. 4, epist. 5,) Augustine, (de Civitate Dei, lib. 8, cap. 27, lib. 22, cap. 10; cont., Faust. Manich. lib. 20, cap. 21.)

2. Nor do we only venerate the Saints, and give thanks for them, but we ask to be fortified with the help of the Divine protection by their prayers and merits in all things; rightly feeling that they, like citizens of the same community and members of the same body, still bound to us by

one spirit and bond of charity, long for our salvation, and grieve for our ills, and therefore, in behalf of our necessity, intercede with God, our common Father, through Jesus Christ, the common Mediator of all. To do so, both that right of community in which they are joined with us, and also precept, induce them. "Pray," says James, (chap. v.) "for one another, that ye may be healed." Then that love which they bear towards us persuades and admonishes them, while that faculty by which they now live with God, secure as to themselves, and free from defects and infirmities, does not prevent them. That they do this in the other life we learn from plain passages of Scripture, as 2 Maccab. xv. 14, where Onias is seen stretching forth his hands and praying for the people. "And another man, venerable from age and glory, of whom it is said, This is the lover of the brethren and of the people of Israel, that is, who prays much for the people and the whole holy city of Jerusalem," says the prophet Jeremiah; and in the first of Zechariah, an angel intercedes for the cities of Judah, "O Lord of hosts! how long wilt thou not pity Jerusalem, and the cities of Judah, with which thou art wroth?" (Zech. i. 12.)

3. In this belief, as we ask those who live with us in the flesh, so we ask the Saints, living with God, to pray for us; and that they may pray for us, we call upon them by name, and doubt not but it is easy for Him who can do all things to cause, whether by the ministry of angels, or by another way and method pleasing to himself, that the Saints have a knowledge of our petitions, just as he causes the angels of heaven to know of the conversion of a sinner, and to rejoice in it.

4. The merits of Saints we hold not to be such as we find in Christ, who, offering himself and shedding his own blood for us, procured for the world full reconciliation with God. But the Saints have derived their merits, by which both they themselves were saved, and now assist us, from the same source of all salvation and all merit, viz., the passion of Christ. For if we look to strict justice, the workings of no Saint, however fruitful, would have sufficed for his own salvation, according to the words, "In thy sight shall no man

living be justified," (Psalm cxliii. 2;) and the saying of Christ, "When ye have done all that was commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants," (Luke xvii. 10;) and the declaration of Paul, "The sufferings of the present time are not worthy, in regard to the future glory which shall be revealed in us." (Rom. viii. 18.) But from the mercy and liberality of God and the grace of Christ, the merits of the saints not only conduce to their own salvation, but are also available to us for protection and the obtaining of divine grace, God mercifully fulfilling in them what he truly promised, when he says, "I am thy strong God, jealous, visiting the iniquities of children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me, and shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments." (Exod. xx. 5, 6.) Thus the merits of deceased Abraham profited his son Isaac; and Jacob, instructing his grandchildren in religion, taught that his own name and that of his father's should be invoked over them. (Gen. xxvii.) This Moses did with full confidence. "Let thine anger," says he, (Exod. xxxii. 13,) "cease, and be merciful to the iniquity of thy people: remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, thy servants." So, too, because of the favour which God had for David, the man according to his own heart, his whole posterity, often to their advantage, experienced the indulgence of God. (3 Kings xii.; 4 Kings xix.; Isaiah xxx. 7; Ezek. xiv.)

Chapter XXIV.—Of the Remembrance of the Dead in Christ.

1. Our Lord Jesus Christ, fixing himself upon the Cross, according to the will of the Father, as a salutary Victim for redeeming men, had gathered together within himself, as his members, all those who, by faith and prayer, had anticipated this victim destined from the foundation of the world to save men, or who were to embrace it by faith in after times, it being his will that the benefit of his death should extend equally to all who should ever become members of his body. Hence the Church, cultivating the remembrance of this common Sacrifice, ought to invite all the members alike, and not exclude any one of those who, ac-

cording to the liberal intention of the Lord, are capable of benefit from this sacrifice. Accordingly, as she first introduces the remembrance of the Saints, so she afterwards introduces the Remembrance, around the altar of sacrifice, of other Christians also, whom she believes to have departed piously in the true faith of Christ, but of whom she cannot be very certain whether they departed hence sufficiently cleansed and purified. She, however, makes one commemoration of the Saints, and another of those who are Resting in the Sleep of Peace—of the former, not that we should pray for them, but rather that they should pray for us, that we may keep in their footsteps—of the latter, that we may supplicate the common Lord on their behalf, that God may be pleased, through our Lord Jesus Christ, to favour all who rest in Christ with an abode of refreshment, light, and power.

2. That we should not exclude from the benefit of our Prayers those who have gone before us in the profession of the faith, the very mention of that communion which we profess to hold with all Saints distinctly demands; because, though freed from the body, they are linked with us by spiritual ties, and are attached to us by one spirit as members of the same body, and, connected by the bond of charity, adhere to us; neither can mortal Death cut off or separate them from the tie of Christ's mystical body.

3. Seeing, then, that the Form of Prayer which our Lord hath taught us is such that no man ought to ask for his own advantage only, but as the citizen of a great community ask for the advantage of all, and he commands us by his Apostle (James v.) to pray one for another that we may be saved, it were great cruelty toward their fellows, and great presumption toward the Lord, for any to exclude The Dead in Christ from the subject of their prayers. This Scripture nowhere commands us to do, and the nature of the spiritual communion which we profess to have with all the Saints distinctly forbids.

4. That this custom, diffused throughout the whole Church of Christ, by which Remembrance of the Dead is made around the Sacrifice of the altar, flowed from Apostolic Tradition, is

abundantly shewn by strong and credible testimony. Dionysius the Areopagite, in his book of Celestial Hierarchy, (cap. vii.) says, "With regard to Praying for the Dead, the tradition came to us from divine guides, I mean the Apostles," where he clearly explains the whole order and method of these prayers. "That prayer," says he, "implores the divine mercy to remit all the sins committed by the deceased through human infirmity, and to place him in light and the land of the living."

5. Chrysostom says to the people of Antioch, (Hom. 69,) "Not without cause did the Apostles give their sanction that a Commemoration of the Dead should be made in the most awful mysteries, for they know that much gain thence accrues to them: for when the people stand with outstretched hands, and the awful Sacrifice is held forth, how should we not, in praying for them, obtain our prayer from God?"

6. Damascenus says, "The Apostles, the disciples of the Saviour, who made the circuit of the whole world, preaching the word of life, which they had seen with their eyes, declared that Remembrance of those who have slept in the faith was to be made in the awful and life-giving Sacraments. This the Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ and God still observes steadily, and also without contradiction from one end of the earth to the other, from that time even to the present, and will even to the end." (Damascenus in Serm. de iis qui in fide hinc migraverint.)

7. Augustine—"Nor is it to be denied that the Souls of the Dead are relieved by the piety of their living relatives, when the Sacrifice of the Mediator is offered for them, or alms even given in the Church: but these things are beneficial to those who merited during their lives that they should be beneficial." (Aug. Enchirid. cap. Joan. Quaest. 2, ad Dulich.)

8. See to the same effect in Epiphanius, (lib. 3, Cont. Haeres.;) Tertullian, (ad Uxor. de Corona Militis;) Ambrose, (Orat. pro Imp. Theod. et lib. 2, Epist. ad Fausti;) Cyprian, (lib. i. epist. 9;) Bernard, (Cant. 1, serm. 66.)

9. After the Commemoration of the Dead, and the Church has again commended the common safety of the living to a

merciful Lord, the other Prayers are employed in a worthy preparation for taking the holy Eucharist: which part of the Mass is peculiar to those present, and taking the holy Eucharist sacramentally, or, at least, spiritually. It does not much serve for the common good, for as no man can be baptized, so neither can he take the Sacrament profitably for another. The Sacrament being at length partaken, and the other things duly performed, "thanksgiving," as Augustine says, "concludes the whole."

Chapter XXV.—Of joining Communion with Sacrifice.

And it may be here expedient, while that most true and singular Sacrifice is offered to call to mind the ancient practice of the Church, (Aug. de Spirit. et Lit. c. 2,) by which not only the Priest sacrificing, but also the Deacons and other Ministers of the Church, who, on more solemn days, are admitted as witnesses of this great Sacrifice, and assistants in the necessary services were enjoined by a series of Canons, (De Consecra. dist. 2, can. Peract. can. Relatum,) to be partakers of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. All the faithful, also, in order to celebrate the remembrance of the death of the Lord and our redemption, when flocking to this Sacrifice of our Redeemer, are to be admonished and excited by sedulous exhortation, after they have first examined themselves, Confessed, and obtained Absolution, to take the grace of the Holy Communion, and be frequent in carefully and devoutly partaking of the most divine Eucharist along with the Priest.

Chapter XXVI.—Of Ceremonies and the Use of the Sacraments.

1. Let the Ancient Ceremonies used in the Sacrament of Baptism be all retained, viz., Exorcism, Renunciation, Profession of Faith, Chrism, &c., for they tend to figure and shew forth the efficacy of this Sacrament.

2. It likewise seems that no change should be made in the Ancient Ceremonies which are used by the Catholic Church in the Mass, for they are all particularly appropriate to what is done in the Mass.

3. With regard to the use of this Ordinance, two Masses ought at least to be celebrated every day, in each city, and in each church, (though there be several churches in one city or place,) which has proper Priests and an attendance of people—one morning Mass, at which those may be present who gain a living by the labour of their hands, when assembling they may either communicate in the Eucharist, or piously commend themselves to God; and another, with greater splendour, which may be chanted about eight o'clock, A. M., at which may be present in like manner such as wish either to communicate in the Eucharist or to commend themselves to God. In country districts let one Mass at least be celebrated every Lord's day and Feast day.

4. And that the people may be conveniently recalled to the use of Masses, Preachers, in accordance with the view of this rite above explained, ought to exhort the people to give a willing attendance on the same; and certain meditations adapted to each part of the Mass should be prescribed; and before commencing, the Presbyter or Deacon, if there be an opportunity, should shew the true use of the Mass, and recommend it to the people by formulary which may be agreed upon, according to the nature of this Ordinance, as above explained.

5. Let the Canon likewise, in which nothing is to be changed, have its succinct and lucid interpretation, that thereby Presbyters may be the better able both to understand the performance of their office, and explain what they understand to the people.

6. Let the other Ceremonies of Sacrament be used according to the form of the Ancient Agendae: should anything, however, have crept into them which may occasion superstition, let it be taken away.

7. Let Altars, sacerdotal vestments, church vessels, banners, likewise crosses, tapers, images, be retained in the Church. But let it be so that they may be memorials, and that no worship of *latria* be transferred to things of this nature, nor let there be a superstitious flocking to statues and images.

8. Likewise let Canonical Hours and that pious Psalmody

which the Apostle himself has recommended to us, (1 Cor. xiv. 15, 26,) be by no means abolished in churches; where they have been discontinued let them be restored, and especially as to time on the Lord's Day, and other ancient and more solemn feast days.

9. Those things which have been added concerning the Saints to what is contained in the ancient ordinary concerning Saints, are to be recalled, and if in any respect they have gone to excess they are to be corrected.

10. Let Vigils likewise, and Obsequies of the Dead, be celebrated after the custom of the Ancient Church, for it were monstrous to retain no remembrance of them in the Church, as if their souls had perished along with their bodies.

11. Let the Feast Days also received by the Church be retained; if not all at least the principal—the Lord's Day—the Nativity of our Lord—the Circumcision of our Lord—the Epiphany—Palm Sunday—Easter, with the two days following—the Ascension of our Lord—Pentecost, with the two days following—Corpus Christi—the Feast Days of the blessed Virgin Mary, and the Holy Apostles—the Feasts of John Baptist, Mary Magdalene, Stephen, Laurence, Martin, and Michael, of all the Saints; and, in individual Churches, of those Saints who are held to be their special patrons, that on these Feasts of the Saints we may honour God in the Saints, and be stirred up to imitate them, and reflect that we are aided by their prayers, and associated in their merits.

12. Likewise, let Rogation Sunday previous to the Ascension of our Lord, and the Litany on the day of St. Mark, and the other customary processions during the year, be observed according to ancient practice.

13. In like manner let the due solemnities be used on Holy Sundays, and in regard to the other Feasts of the Church, and for the Eve of Easter and Pentecost, let Baptismal water be prepared with solemn benediction in all Parish Churches.

14. And seeing that Abstinence from Flesh, when practised not because of abomination but of temperance, is in itself good, and fit to chasten the flesh, while, moreover, flocks can scarcely supply the daily consumption of animal food, let the practice and ordinance of the Ancient Church

as to days of Fasting be retained by abstaining from flesh on Friday and Saturday.

15. For the Church instituted this Abstinence from no superstition which abstains from meats at certain set times, nor on account of any impurity in meats, (knowing that to the pure all things are pure, and that nothing which entereth the mouth defileth the man,) but in order to tame the flesh, so that the soul may be the better restrained from vicious desires and evil motions; and she has appointed that Abstinence especially on Fridays and Saturdays, that men prepared by a two days' abstinence might approach in a fitter and worthier state to pay due worship to God, to hear his word, and partake of the holy Eucharist, (which was anciently more frequently practised on the Lord's Day.) And they might by this voluntary castigation, as if with Christ, (the remembrance of whose Passion is especially cherished by the faithful on that day,) crucify their flesh.

16. Let also the customary Fasts of the Church be observed, but without astricting those who have a necessary excuse, such as persons exhausted by severe labour, and travellers, likewise pregnant women, children at the breast, the aged and the sick.

17. Nor let the Benediction of those things which are prepared for the use of men by Exorcisms and Prayers be disapproved, provided the operations thence arising be ascribed not to the things themselves, but to divine energy, and let care be taken that the same be not transferred to any kind of incantation or superstition.

18. And although we ought to feel with the Apostle that he who is a Bachelor cares for the things which are the Lord's, &c., and it were the more to be wished that many Clergy may be found who, while they are Bachelors, are also truly continent; yet seeing that many who hold the functions of the Ecclesiastical Office have already in many places taken wives whom they are unwilling to put away, in that matter let the sentiments of a General Council be waited for, seeing that otherwise, as the times are, a change cannot be now made without causing grievous disturbances.

19. It is not however to be denied, that though Marriage

is honourable in itself, according to Scripture, yet, according to Scripture, he who marries not and is continent, does better.

20. The same is the case with regard to the use of the Eucharist UNDER BOTH SPECIES, to which many have also become accustomed, and from which they cannot at this time be torn away without grievous commotions; and as the Œcumenical Council, to which all the States of the Empire have given in their submission, will doubtless employ pious and anxious care to make the best provision in this case for the consciences of many, and the public tranquillity, let them who have previously received the use of Both Species, and are unwilling to relinquish it, wait with reference to this matter also for the deliberation and sentence of the Œcumenical Council.

21. Those, however, who cling to the use of Both Species, ought not to censure the inveterate practice of Communicating under one species: nor should the parties trouble each other until the Œcumenical Council have decreed on the matter.

22. And although the Sacrament of the Eucharist was instituted under Both Species, it is not to be thought that Christ incarnate is divided, contrary to what the divinely inspired Scripture delivers, but that he is contained entire under each species.

23. Since there is in the Sacrament of the Eucharist the true body of Christ, and the true blood of Christ, in this Sacrament Christ ought justly to be adored.

24. And likewise, the Sacrament of the Eucharist once consecrated by the word of Christ, though it be kept for a longer time, remains the Sacrament and the body and blood of Christ until it be taken.

25. Those things which pertain to the Discipline of Clergy and People, seem to be among the most necessary for removing from Churches those Scandals which give great cause to the perturbation of these times, as the fact itself speaks. Wherefore, if the Imperial Majesty shall procure any useful Reformation to Churches, so far will any one who studies our Holy Religion and the public tranquillity be from wishing to repudiate it, that all ought to labour strenuously to the utmost to further and procure its speedy accomplishment.

JOHN CALVIN

ON

THE TRUE METHOD OF GIVING PEACE TO CHRISTENDOM AND REFORMING THE CHURCH.

"SPECIOUS indeed is the name of PEACE," says Hilary, "and fair the idea of UNITY; but who doubts that the only PEACE OF THE CHURCH is that which is of Christ?"—truly an admirable sentiment which ought to arise in our mind whenever we treat of ESTABLISHING PEACE AND CONCORD AMONG CHRISTIANS, and especially when the object sought is CONSENT IN DOCTRINE. For as pious and moderate men are averse to dissension and detest contention and strife, it can scarcely happen that any discourse whatever which proposes to quell them shall not be plausible at first sight. And who, if not devoid of humanity, does not willingly lend his ear and his mind when true and serious mention is made of PACIFYING THE CHURCH? There is no man possessed only of a moderate sense of piety whom this foul and dreadful rending of the body of Christ does not grieve and excruciate. But seeing that crafty men not unfrequently insinuate themselves under this pretext, while they seek to adulterate the pure doctrine of Christ, who can deny that it is the part of prudence to look cautiously at the kind of Peace which is offered us? For as Christ always recommends peace to us as a primary object, so he teaches that the truth of his Gospel is the only bond of peace. Wherefore, it is of no use for those who are trying to seduce us from the pure profession of the Gospel, to gloss it over with the name of Concord. What then? Peace is indeed to be longed for and sought with the utmost zeal; but rather than it should be purchased by any loss of piety, let heaven and earth, if need be, go into confusion!

I am not here debating with Turks and Jews, who would wish the name of Christ utterly extinguished, or with grosser

Papists, who demand from us an open abjuration of true doctrine, but with the contrivers of a kind of specious PACIFICATION, who leave us a half Christ, but in such a manner that there is no part of his doctrine which they do not obscure or bespatter with some stain of falsehood. And this artifice for deforming piety they send forth—so help them! —under the name of REFORMATION! Is it thus that while they secretly lead us away from the Author of peace, they gloss over the matter by vainly promising peace? They shall never succeed so far with their dissimulation as to prevent their counsels from being disclosed. They doubtless hope that if the Churches which have embraced the purer doctrine of the gospel once decline and allow themselves to be corrupted in any quarter, it will be easy to make them forthwith lose whatever good remains. And, verily, they are not wrong in this opinion. For by the most just and the ordinary judgment of God, those who knowingly and willingly allow his sacred truth to be polluted with lies, are totally deprived of the valuable possession. For it is not a thing of such vulgar worth, that what is deemed most precious among men should be purchased at the cost of impairing it in the least. I am aware, indeed, that the impious and profane do not form their estimate of the future according to the judgment of God. But without knowing the cause, they judge rightly of the event.

It is strange, however, that some are so fickle, not to say alienated in mind, as to put faith in the words of such men! I am not ignorant of their thought. It is, that if they now yield a little, they will make a greater progress afterwards, when the occasion offers. But whence is that occasion which they promise themselves suddenly to arise? I now see them receding from the right path. Therefore there is nothing that can less be hoped than that they are to reach the goal by wandering from it: nay, rather it is to be feared that God may shew himself the avenger of their perfidious defection, by withdrawing the part which they retain. But whatever be their fancied hope, they take too much, far too much upon them, when they bargain concerning the eternal and immutable Truth of God, how far it is to prevail! They say—

provided what is fundamental remains safe, the loss of other things is tolerable. They speak thus just as if Christ had given himself up to be divided at their pleasure. It is something, I admit, when the entire renewal of piety cannot all at once be obtained, to secure at least the principal heads, provided we cease not to follow after what is still wanting. But when the Son of God has given us the doctrine of his gospel to be enjoyed entire, to rend it by compact, in order to preserve some part for ourselves, is most sacrilegious.

But here it lies. When a struggle for life must be endured, few know what it is to defend the cause of Christ. Nay, these men carry their effrontery so far as to declare, that it is no part of their intention to tempt God rashly, (by exposing themselves rashly.) As if those were throwing themselves into unnecessary danger, who choose to suffer any extremities rather than deviate one hair's-breadth from the doctrine of life. Where then are the lofty terms in which they spoke a little ago with their swords in their hands? How is it that, with them, constancy in defending the Truth begins to be temerity the moment they see that they must die rather than secede from it? Let us, however, be mindful of the exhortation of Paul, and hasten to give glory to Christ and his gospel, whether it be by life or by death. Whatever may happen, let it be our resolute determination to listen to no terms of peace, which mingle the figments of men with the pure truth of God. Let it, I say, be our fixed principle, that the voice of the Shepherd alone is to be heard, that of strangers guarded against and rejected.

Hence it is easy to infer what plan is to be adopted in pacifying dissension. For did not the offences of men terrify, and, as it were, blind us, nay, did not some, while they would be too cautious, walk blindfold in the clearest light, we should easily come to an agreement as to the heads of doctrine which are necessary to preserve the state of the Church. But as a right judgment cannot be formed except from the case itself, I think it will be worth while briefly to review the points in which nothing can be yielded.

I know it is a common saying with many, that we are not

to stand out pertinaciously on other points, provided the doctrine of free Justification remains safe. Those who speak thus do not say the whole, and yet say something. I admit, indeed, that a solid knowledge of our salvation is never possessed by us, without carrying along with it almost the whole sum of Christian doctrine. But, first, in a sum of Christian doctrine not only to postpone the worship of God, (in which his honour turns,) but to pass it over in silence, were very unjust, as I shall again advert to afterwards. Secondly, there is a great difference between merely uttering the one expression—we are justified by faith—and setting forth the whole matter in a distinct explanation. If in matters, however trivial, all are wont carefully to obviate disputes, which might arise from obscurity of language, why should not the same at least, if not greater caution be used in a matter of the highest moment?

Hence, in order that these men may prove their carefulness to retain this part of doctrine concerning gratuitous Justification unimpaired, they must first determine what man is capable of by himself. For in discriminating between the nature of man and the grace of God, the first thing in order is to see what belongs to the former as its own. Here I know not what mediators rise up, who, that they may slay pious souls while seeming to appease their opponents by equivocating subtleties, leave man freedom of will, though weak and damaged. In other words, they are liberal with what is not theirs, when they transfer to man that which belongs to the grace of God.

It must be acknowledged, indeed, that man retains a will even though it is held captive under the tyranny of sin and Satan; but how do they think they will satisfy us, when they awkwardly restrict the proud name of freedom by the epithet of a weak power? Then when they describe the mode of obtaining Justification, they teach that God does not act with man as with a block, that he does not draw him without his being willing. Who denies this? But the question is, whence comes that teachableness of the human will which makes it show itself obedient to God, while nature is altogether contumacious and intractable? Is it not to

stumble on the threshold when they on the one hand extenuate the misery of man, and on the other obscure the aid of Divine grace? Either, then, the true method of Justification will not be at all possessed by us, or we must make this our starting point, viz., that the mind of man is blind until it is illuminated by the Spirit of God—that the will is enslaved to evil, and wholly carried and hurried to evil, until corrected by the same Spirit, and that the voluntary reception of grace cannot have any other origin than this—that God forming a heart of flesh out of our stony heart, brings us who were formerly turned away back to himself.

When we come to the definition of the word, care must be taken that respect to works be not intermingled with gratuitous Reconciliation, which wholly consists in the forgiveness of sins. For though we are never reconciled to God, without being at the same time presented with inherent righteousness, yet things which cannot be separated ought to be distinguished. And this is the second branch in this question, viz., to have the method by which God justifies us defined. We say, therefore, that we are justified by faith, because the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us. If any one, on the other hand, objects that we are made partakers of Christ only by being renewed by his Spirit unto the obedience of the law, this must be acknowledged to be true; but let Regeneration be what it may, we deny that Justification is to be placed in it.

We do not act thus either from a love of disputation, or because we will not allow anything to be passed over that does not altogether please us. The cause which urges us is most necessary. The point involved is peace of conscience, without which we must all be most wretched, nay, almost undone. It is asked, I say, where our consciences may rest safely in regard to salvation. If they are agitated by disquietude, or in doubt, Paul teaches that faith is made void. (Rom. iv. 14.) And he declares that this is the necessary result, so long as they look to the law. What then? That we may have salvation, we must at the same time have a sure conviction of righteousness. Any part of this righteousness, however small, if placed in works will totter, as resting on

an insecure foundation. It remains, therefore, to recline solely on the pardon of sins. It is a plain matter, that we cannot come boldly before the tribunal of God, unless we are certainly persuaded that he is our Father: and this cannot be without our being regarded as righteous in his sight. Thus we are precluded from all access to him, until trusting in his paternal good will, we can without hesitation invoke him as our Father. But if there is no salvation and no invocation of God, without tranquil and sure trust for the conscience; and, on the other hand, if conscience cannot rest in anything short of certain righteousness, who can doubt that the whole righteousness on which man ought to lean, is contained in the free remission of sins? Our mediators then only gloss the matter in pretending that inherent righteousness concurs with the merit of Christ, when the point under discussion is the mode of justifying. Such concurrence must necessarily beget a fearful conflict, until, altogether forgetting works and discarding the mention of them, we obtain not a part of righteousness only, but the whole entire from Christ.

They say that God does not act with us after the manner of an earthly judge, who only acquits, and does not also bestow true righteousness. I admit it. But while a twofold grace is at the same time bestowed upon us by Christ, we ought carefully to consider the effect of each. The question now asked is, In what way are we accepted by God? If works are mixed up with the free Imputation of Righteousness, another question will immediately arise, viz., how far works avail in procuring the favour of God, and whether free imputation holds the chief place, or is only a kind of inferior auxiliary? What else is this than completely to subvert the foundation? Accordingly, Paul deservedly includes the righteousness of faith simply in forgiveness of sins, teaching that it is described by David when he pronounces the man blessed to whom sins are not imputed. (Rom. iv. 6; Psalm xxxii. 2.) And certainly that blessedness which David mentions flows from righteousness. It follows, then, that we are righteous in this, that our sins are not imputed. Hence, Zacharias in his song describes instruction concern-

ing the forgiveness of sins, as the knowledge of salvation. (Luke i. 77.)

On the whole, let us remember that the debate here is not simply concerning the manifold grace of God toward us, but concerning the cause of our Reconciliation with him. This cause, unless it is fixed as one, is null. For Scripture does not tell us to borrow only part of our righteousness from Christ in order to supply what is wanting in our works; but the Apostle plainly declares that Christ himself was made righteousness to us. And in another passage he declares, that men are righteous before God by the very circumstance that our sins are no longer imputed to us. (1 Cor. i. 30; 2 Cor. v. 19.)

Both the magnitude and variety of the blessings which we receive from Christ are indeed to be extolled; nor does it become us to restrict his office and efficacy to any one species. Nor, when we say that men are justified by the benefit of Christ, are we to be silent as to the grace of Regeneration; nay, rather, we must take care not to separate what the Lord perpetually conjoins. What then? Let men be taught that it is impossible they can be regarded as righteous by the merit of Christ, without being renewed by his Spirit unto a holy life; and that it is in vain for any in whom the Spirit of regeneration dwells, not to glory in the free adoption of God; in short, that God receives none into favour who are not also made truly righteous. But there is need of distinction, lest the one of the two gifts should derogate from the other. Let the children of God consider that Regeneration is necessary to them, but that, nevertheless, their full righteousness consists in Christ—let them understand that they have been ordained and created unto holiness of life and the study of good works, but that, nevertheless, they must recline on the merits of Christ with their whole soul—let them enjoy the righteousness of life which has been bestowed upon them, still, however, distrusting it so as not to bring before the tribunal of God any other trust than trust in the obedience of Christ.

In order that ambiguities may be removed, it is necessary that the Righteousness which we obtain by faith, and

which is freely bestowed upon us, should be placed in the highest rank, so that, as often as the conscience is brought before the tribunal of God, it alone may shine forth. In this way the righteousness of works, to whatever extent it may exist in us, being reduced to its own place, will never come, as it were, into conflict with the other; and certainly it is just, that as righteousness of works depends on righteousness of faith, it should be made subordinate to it, so as to leave the latter in full possession of the salvation of man. There can be no doubt that Paul, when he treats of the Justification of man, confines himself to the one point—how man may ascertain that God is propitious to him? Here he does not remind us of a quality infused into us; on the contrary, making no mention of works, he tells us that righteousness must be sought without us; otherwise that certainty of faith, which he everywhere so strongly urges, could never stand; still less could there be ground for the contrast between the righteousness of faith and works which he draws in the tenth chapter to the Romans. Wherefore, unless we choose to sport with so serious a matter, (this would be fraught with danger!) we must retain propriety of expression, which carries with it the knowledge of the thing expressed. Were the thing conceded to us by those who entangle this part of the doctrine by their comments, I would easily give up all contest about the word. But those who confound the two kinds of righteousness together, seeing the thing they aim at is to prevent the righteousness of Christ from being entirely gratuitous, are on no account to be borne.

But we must obviate their cavil, when they bring forward James, and collect other passages in Scripture, where the term *justify* is taken differently, to establish what they call *concurrence.* James does not mean that man acquires righteousness with God, even in the minutest degree, by the merit of works; he is only treating of the approval of righteousness. (James ii. 21.) And who denies that every man proves what he is by his actions? But to furnish men with credible evidence of your disposition is a very different thing from meriting salvation in the sight of God. Hence, not to be imposed upon by the different meanings of the

word, we must always observe whether reference is made to God or to men. Moreover, we deny not that the righteous are called the children of God, in respect of holiness of life, as well as in respect of a pure conscience: but as no work, if weighed in the Divine balance, will be found otherwise than maimed, and even defiled by impurities, we conclude, that this name of righteousness, when given to works, is founded on free pardon. Believers, therefore, are righteous by works, just because they are righteous without any merit of, or without any respect to works, seeing that the righteousness of works depends on the righteousness of faith.

Hence, too, it is apparent what we ought to think concerning the Reward of Works. Assuredly the labour of the godly is not in vain in the Lord, seeing various rewards are daily paid to it in the world, and the highest reward is laid up for it in the heavens. But they are greatly mistaken who think that any reward is paid to good works by way of debt: for we must always return to this, that as God declares there is no righteousness except in the perfect obedience of the law, so men merit nothing unless they fulfil all the commandments of the law out and out. If strict justice decide, an eternal curse awaits every man who fails in one single iota. Wherefore, the whole promises which make the fulfilling of the law a condition, Paul hesitates not to term void, till that strictness has been mitigated by virtue of a free promise.

A free promise I do not understand in the same way as many do. I hold it to be free, not because, while we owe ourselves and our all to God, he has spontaneously and liberally promised a reward to works which he might demand of us as his right, but because he assigns a reward proportioned to the worth of his own favour rather than to any worth in them. For that promise, however liberal, which stipulated for the fulfilment of the law, gives us no assistance by itself, since no man ever will be found to satisfy his duty. Hence there is need of the aid of a new promise, viz., that works shall have a reward, because they are acceptable in consequence of pardon. In this way, believers are not defrauded by the hope of reward, which ought

to stimulate them to the study of good works; nor are they either puffed up with perverse confidence, or elated with vain glory. The true nature of the reward is this—it does not correspond in equity to the merit or worth of the works, but is derived from their gratuitous acceptance.

Moreover, we cannot submit to allow faith itself to be not only obscured, but also adulterated, by a false interpretation. They do so who pretend that it can truly exist without charity. This is the old invention of the sophists, that a faith which is *informal* is nevertheless real, and that it becomes *formed* by the addition of charity. Hence, too, has arisen the error of supposing that faith is a bare and frigid knowledge, which indistinctly apprehends that God is true. We dispute not about words; but as the salvation of men turns on this question, the ambiguity which involves the whole question in darkness is fraught with peril. As God justifies us freely by imputing the obedience of Christ to us, so we are rendered capable of this great blessing only by faith alone. As the Son of God expiated our sins by the sacrifice of his death, and, by appeasing his Father's wrath, acquired the gift of adoption for us, and now presents us with his righteousness, so it is only by faith we put him on, and become partakers of his blessings. Now, if we know not what faith is, what access shall we have to obtain salvation? Those who, in the present day, purchase peace from the Papists by equivocating arrangements, admit that the true faith which discriminates between Christians and unbelievers may be void of charity. They act just like a man who praises the wine contained in his cask, and cuts off the cork to prevent any one from getting a draught of it.

It is now, I presume, clear enough how important it is, in order to maintain the doctrine of Justification entire, to have a sure definition of faith. What it is may be partly inferred from the effect of justification. It justifies because it makes us put on Christ, that he may dwell in us, and we be his members. Can that which makes us one with the Son of God exist without his Spirit? This were no less absurd than for any one to assert that the soul which animates the body, which gives it sense and motion, and is, in short, its life, is

itself without life. Any one who holds the one point, that Christ is possessed by faith, will no longer think of entertaining the distinction of an "informal" and a "formed" faith. Faith, I say, is a firm certainty of conscience, which embraces Christ as he is offered to us by the gospel. But is not faith one of the principal gifts which newness of life bestows upon us? Hence, too, it is said to have been given us for a sign. Faith is the resurrection of the soul, as Christ declares in these words,—"He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live." (John xi. 26.) How then can it be dead while it gives life? Faith is the evidence of divine adoption. But how can we be the sons of God, unless we are guided by his Spirit? Faith gives us access to God. How can we have access without a good conscience?

Assuming the contrary of all this, or saying nothing about it, still it is necessary, if we would be at peace in the unity of the faith, previously to agree as to the term Faith. But, as I have already premised, it is enough for me to demonstrate how far they are from retaining Justification, who, while they study to appear the enemies of the truth, devise a middle kind of doctrine, which suits neither heaven nor earth. To this subject I confine myself.

With regard, then, to the obtaining of Righteousness before God, I say that we must necessarily hold the following five points concerning Faith:—First, that it is an undoubting persuasion, by which we receive the word brought by Prophets and Apostles as truth sent from God. Secondly, that what it properly looks to in the Word of God is the free promises, and especially Christ, their pledge and foundation, so that, resting on the paternal favour of God, we can venture to entertain a confident hope of eternal salvation. Thirdly, that it is not a bare knowledge which flutters in the mind, but that it carries along with it a lively affection, which has its seat in the heart. Fourthly, that this faith does not spring from the perspicacity of the human mind, or the proper movement of the heart, but is the special work of the Holy Spirit, whose it is both to enlighten the mind and impress the heart. Lastly, that this efficacy of the Spirit is not felt by all promiscuously, but by those who are ordained to life.

The first point we have set down, being acknowledged by all, needs no proof. In proving the second it is not so necessary to be diligent in collecting passages, as to admonish the reader to weigh those which occur throughout the Scriptures; for they are almost innumerable, and we must study brevity.

When Paul distinguishes the gospel from the law, he calls it "the doctrine of faith." (Rom. x. 6.) And he in another place teaches that "therein is revealed the righteousness of God from faith to faith." (Rom. i. 17.) Again he says, "Therefore it is of faith, that it may be by grace, that the promise may be sure." (Rom. iv. 16.) To the same effect he writes, that the gospel is preached for "the obedience of the faith." (Rom. i. 5.) And after teaching that "the gospel is not by the law, but by promise," he immediately concludes, "that the promise may be given by faith." (Gal. iii. 22.) These words plainly denote a mutual relation between faith and the free promises of God. Hence it follows that faith rests in Christ alone, all the promises of God being in him, yea and amen. (2 Cor. i. 20.) For "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish." (John iii. 16.) It is not without cause that this sentiment is so often repeated. Wherefore Paul, in another place, where he commends the light of the gospel, says that there "the glory of God shines in the face of Jesus Christ." (2 Cor. iv. 6.) Nor is it at random that, when the Scripture mentions faith, it is added, by way of exposition, "in Christ." For this addition signifies, as is taught more at large in the third chapter to the Romans, that Christ has been set forth as a propitiation, that by faith, through the intervention of his blood, we may be freely justified by the grace of God. The same thing he afterwards confirms in several places. His meaning is the same as when he writes to the Galatians, (Gal. iii. 6,) that the promises were established only in one seed, viz., Christ. For the same reason, both in the Epistles to the Romans and the Philippians, he interprets faith as the knowledge of the Son of God, in which he includes all the wisdom of the godly, in like manner as he elsewhere declares that no other know-

ledge has any excellency, and glories in having preached Christ, as containing the whole sum of the gospel. (Eph. iv. 13; Phil. iii. 8; 1 Cor. ii. 2.)

Moreover, that confidence in the Divine love towards us is produced by Faith, one passage abundantly testifies, viz., the fifth to the Romans, where Paul teaches that we have peace of conscience, so as to dare to glory in the hope of eternal life. (Rom. v. 11.) He had previously said, that to keep us from wavering in doubt and trepidation, we are heirs by faith, (Rom. iv. 16;) whence it is clear that a firm certainty is required. In the same manner he writes to the Ephesians, that we have boldness and access to the Father with confidence, through faith in him. (Eph. iii. 12.) Nor does John tell us to think, but to know, that we are the sons of God, although it doth not yet appear. (1 John iii. 2.) He, therefore, who does not hold this, is altogether ignorant of the nature of faith.

This position being laid down, it is clear that faith is always combined with serious impressions. Were it otherwise Paul would not enjoin us to fix our roots in Christ, and rear the superstructure on faith; nor would faith itself have the name of obedience, far less would it be called our victory over the world. (Col. ii. 7; Phil. ii. 12; Rom. i. 5; 1 John v. 4.) And surely when Paul writes, that with the heart we believe unto righteousness, he does not place faith in the brain. (Rom. x. 10.) I now omit the epithets I formerly mentioned—that it is the life of the soul, that by it Christ dwells in us, that it is the cause of our obtaining salvation, and the like. These could by no means apply to mere knowledge. This is what Paul elsewhere means when he says, that we, beholding the face of God in the mirror of the gospel, are transformed into it from glory to glory. (2 Cor. iii. 18.) For the knowledge must be lively and efficacious which thus transforms us into the image of God.

Then, that Faith is the work of Divine illumination Scripture confirms by all the passages in which it charges the human mind with blindness. But as it were too long to collect them all, I shall only note a few of the first which occur.

Paul, throughout the first and second chapters of 1 Corinthians, does nothing else than shew, that all the discernment of the human mind in the mysteries of God is dim and null. Those then who penetrate them are born not of the will of man, or of the flesh, but of God. (John i. 13.) For flesh and blood does not reveal it to them, but our Father in heaven. (Matt. xvi. 17.) Wherefore Paul entreats God in the behalf of the Ephesians, that he would open the eyes of their mind, and give them the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of himself, that they may be able to apprehend what is his calling. (Eph. i. 17, 18.) And justly, since, as he afterwards subjoins, the love of Christ to which we are called surpasses all knowledge. (Eph. iii. 19.) Whence it follows, as he elsewhere affirms, that it is given us to believe, (Phil. i. 29;) that a man can receive nothing except it be given him from above, (John iii. 27;) and that no man can come unto Christ unless the Father draw him. (John vi. 44.) Moreover, if we examine the human heart, we shall find that it is not only prone to distrust, but is carried to it by the whole instinct of nature. Here again, therefore, the Spirit of God must come to our aid, and be to us both an earnest and a seal. (Rom. viii. 15.) He it is who opens our mouth that we dare without fear invoke God as our Father, (Gal. iv. 6,) who sprinkles our souls with the blood of Christ, (1 Peter i. 2,) who ratifies his grace to us, who pervades our hearts with the love of God, so that we boldly glory in being his sons, (Rom. v. 5,) who, in short, leads us into all truth, (John xvi. 13,) so that we may know the things which are given us of God. (1 Cor. ii. 12.)

My last position is taken from Luke, who relates, that as many as were Preordained to eternal life believed Paul's doctrine. And, indeed, seeing that God invites all indiscriminately by outward preaching, the only thing which distinguishes his Elect from the Reprobate is, that, allowing the latter to be blind in the light, he presents the former with new eyes, by which they see, and inclines their hearts to obey his word. Hence he manifests his secret election by effectual calling. He calls us, says Paul, (Eph. i. 4,) as he hath chosen us in his Son before the creation of the world.

Again, "We are his workmanship, created in Christ unto good works, which he hath prepared that we should walk in them." (Eph. ii. 10.) This must be noted, because as men are proud above measure, they seize to themselves what ought to have been ascribed to God alone. To this preposterous arrogance God opposes his free Adoption, which alone is the cause of our being called, and so alone distinguishes us. Never, assuredly, is God anticipated by us, but he seeks the wandering and lost sheep.

Moreover, the efficacy of the Call I mentioned must be understood to consist in that not only is the grace of God offered to us, but our will also is formed to embrace it. For between the Elect and the Reprobate there is this difference, that while God addresses both by the voice of man, he specially teaches the former inwardly by his Spirit. The ministry of man, I say, is common to both, but the inward grace of the Spirit is peculiar to the Elect. Hence the words of Christ, "Whoso hath heard and learned of the Father cometh unto me." (John vi. 45.)

Unless these points are put beyond controversy, though we may ever and anon repeat like parrots that we are justified by faith, we shall never hold the true doctrine of Justification. It is not a whit better to be secretly seduced from the alone foundation of salvation than to be openly driven from it. But there are also other things in which masked mediators maliciously subvert this part of the doctrine which they profess in word to be willing to defend.

They say that the Confession of Sins is necessary in order to obtain pardon. But to whom do they bid us confess? Not to God, but to Priests! Is not the name of Justification more than shamelessly brought forward while consciences are laid under such a necessity? That consciences may be freed from the fear of eternal death, the law of God itself must be abrogated so far as not to bind us by its curse. What then, if they put on the fetters of new laws which bind them more strongly! Scripture declares, that we are justified, not because we fulfil the law, but because we rest on the sacrifice of Christ, by which sins have been expiated. It is not therefore the observance of the law but the pardon

of transgression that justifies us. For when the very forgiveness of sins, which looses us from all chains, is tied to a condition, is not the conscience shaken out of all certainty in regard to salvation? We are promised the forgiveness of sins, provided we shall have confessed into the ear of a priest. What is this, I ask, but just to subject the acquittal of the divine law to a human law, and place it, so to speak, under a kind of servitude? For such legislators enact, that the forgiveness of sins which frees us is not itself to be free.

Besides, it is an atrocious insult to God to arrogate so much to man as to make the Remission of Sins depend on their pleasure, especially seeing that he strictly claims this for himself by the Prophet, "I am, I am he, says he, who wipe away their iniquities." (Isaiah xliii. 25.) What! does God himself, when he offers us this blessing, impose the law of confessing? Does Christ himself, to whom this office and command peculiarly belong, prescribe anything of the kind in forgiving sins? We nowhere read so. Now, when men rise up and lay their veto upon Christ to restrain his grace, is it not more than sacrilegious audacity? And even, if we leave such a right to men as to be the arbiters between God and us, in the matter of grace, by dictating laws, do we not reject the benefit of Christ by such ingratitude? This cannot with any decency be denied. We all in misery flee to the forgiveness of sins as the only asylum of salvation. A certain way is shewn us by the Son of God. A certain method is appointed for obtaining the great boon. Here a mortal man interposes, and dares to preclude access. He points to the door locked by him, and will not allow it to be opened except by the key of confession. Do those who take this tyranny upon them make Christ the only author of righteousness, or do they not rather rob him of part of the honour, and transfer it elsewhere? Where is free righteousness if it is ransomed in this way?

Moreover, as pious souls have already experienced how dire the slaughter was when they were forced to such confession, our false mediators, to make them feel less pain, devise a middle course. They say that Confession is neither,

on the one hand, to be too much relaxed, nor, on the other, to be made too stringent. Certainly some progress seems to be made when part of the anxious enumeration is remitted! Mere trifling! For if we hold that none are acquitted before God but those who have confessed their sins to a priest, who shall take it upon him to deduct one iota? Shall we not always run the risk of having omitted something, for which God may call us into judgment?

Peace of conscience, without which there is no salvation, exists only when there is an undoubting faith in acquittal. If every one must confess before he can be forgiven, it is not for the will of man to define how far this necessity extends. Thus nothing is left but constant disquietude, and slow torture, and perplexing doubts, which will wear out the soul not less effectually than open murder. The mediators are contented with the enumeration of the sins which occur to one thinking and examining himself carefully. What is this but to sprinkle the poison with a drop of honey, to make it less sensible at first taste? For if anything, however small, is wanting to the proper diligence, the sinner will still fail; nay, the whole promise will give way, and abyss will follow abyss. If the knowledge of salvation consists in relying with tranquil mind on the forgiveness of sins, whoever spontaneously puts on this fetter knowingly and willingly throws away his salvation.

To pretend the authority of Christ for this impious tyranny displays no less effrontery than bad faith. The theologasters of Sorbonne, on account of their gross ignorance, might have been pardoned when they corrupted Scripture. Now, in so much light, the same excuse cannot be taken. The mediators tell us, that the power of binding and loosing was given to the Apostles, and they add, that it cannot be exercised unless he who officiates knows whether he ought to loose or retain. Hence they make out their enumeration.

Why should I again discuss a puerile objection which we have so often refuted? When the Apostles are invested with the power of binding and loosing, it is certain that under these terms the power and fruit of the gospel are committed to them. It greatly concerns us to know that the acquittal

pronounced to us by the mouth of man is ratified by God. Let us remember that it is mortal men who testify that we are exempted from liability to eternal death. To attest so great a matter even angels would not be equal! What then would become of us did not the Son of God himself interpone his own authority as a sanction to his command? Moreover, the execution of the command removes all doubt on this head. The Apostles did not discharge their office of binding and loosing by hearing Confessions, but by preaching the gospel. Nay, it is certain that in the better ages, when Religion flourished, the rite was either unknown or not very commonly received. It is beyond dispute, that for a whole thousand years and more the Churches were free from this law, which the new mediators obtrude upon us as perpetual, and of the same date as the gospel. But if this pretended cognizance is so necessary that none but he who has heard can forgive sins, we must charge with temerity, not only all the most excellent Pastors of the Primitive Church, but the Apostles themselves, and, by consequence, the Master and Lord of all, for having dared to bind and loose, while they knew nothing of the practice of confessing!

I know that there are men who, when they see any prospect of advancing their interest, are ready to do anything that may be ordered them. And the reason why they strongly urge Confession is, because they wish to make the world obsequious to them, and to hold it in subjection. On many accounts, therefore, do they contend that the rite of Confession is most useful, in other words, useful, because it suits their personal interest. But when they have said all, the most plausible thing they say is, that they put the wicked to the blush once a year. No doubt, much progress is made when the shame of man weighs more with us than reverence for God and angels! And yet experience, the best of teachers, tells us, that even this is most falsely asserted. For men wanton in sin the more from trusting that they shall be safe, as soon as they have disburdened themselves of anything which inwardly oppresses them, by pouring it into the ear of a Priest. Just as if they could escape the tribunal of God by delegating judgment to men! In short, just as

drunkards do, they prepare themselves by an emetic for a new debauch.

But, on the other hand, how strong the objection which we have to offer. Is it not known that from this hydra innumerable evils spring? But granting that what they insist upon is true, nothing ought to be of weight sufficient to make us consent that consciences shall be brought into bondage, the grace of Christ prostituted, and faith oppressed. Though it were most expedient, I say, that men should be forced to confess their sins, yet to colour Confession and hold it forth as a thing necessary to salvation, is neither expedient nor lawful. Consciences cannot be squeezed by the chains of such laws, without being strangled. Therefore twisting them all asunder, let us learn to have all our feelings in subjection to the promises of free mercy alone.

In like manner, when Scripture treats of the spiritual *forum* of conscience, there is no mention of Satisfactions. The satisfaction of Christ is the only one which not only exempts us from guilt and liabiiity to eternal death, but is the price that buys off temporal punishments also. There is something plausible at first sight in the distinction that the eternal punishment is freely forgiven by the benefit of Christ, and the temporal by our satisfaction, but on a nearer inspection it altogether vanishes. First, we have the opposition of all the prophets, who uniformly attribute relaxation of punishment to the Divine mercy. What God pardons freely, it is certain that we do not merit by our works. When the Prophet introduces God as saying, "For my own sake will I do it, not for your sakes," (Ezek. xx. 44; xxxvi. 22,) the thing spoken of is the remission of temporal punishment. Nay, whenever they flee to seek free pardon, they deprecate external calamities as signs of the Divine anger. And when God receives us into favour, he at the same time promises that he will put an end to our calamities. In short, as punishment follows guilt just as the fruit is borne by the tree, so when guilt is forgiven, punishment, as if its root were cut off, is also extinguished.

It is true, that the best way for men to escape from being judged by God, is to judge themselves, as Paul declares.

(1 Cor. xi. 31.) This, however, must not be taken as if men could appease God by offering some kind of compensation. But since the only object of God in punishing is to urge us to repentance, it is not strange that the sinner obviates the punishment, when he spontaneously corrects himself. Our heavenly Father invites us by words before he strikes with his hand. If a voluntary change appears in us, the object is gained. The cause for punishment now ceases.

In short, as the punishments which are inflicted on the godly respect the future, so he who would avert them instead of studying how to expunge his fault by some satisfaction, should by all possible means train himself to humility and true repentance, thus becoming the avenger of his own sin, and not experiencing God as its avenger. He who wishes God to spare him, must not spare or indulge himself. But all this has nothing to do with mutual compensation. For those who take punishment on themselves in this way, in order to anticipate the judgment of God, consider that they owe to the sacrifice of Christ not only the expiation of their guilt, but also the pardon of whatever punishment they have deserved. Moreover, satisfactions for which there is a use in the Church, being rather designed for example, are a part of its policy, not aids to spiritual justice.

Those who derogate from this doctrine, how specious soever their pretences may be, will always leave it manifest that they are laying deadly snares against the salvation of men. These if we neglect to guard against, we shall in vain afterwards bewail the loss of salvation, which we shall have spontaneously betrayed to Satan and his ministers. Wherefore, we must beware of being lulled by the siren songs,—"This is a small matter—this will be modified by a suitable interpretation—this will be kept latent—this may be admitted with no great danger." Let us rather hear Christ admonishing us,—"Walk while ye have light." (John xii. 35.) For if we allow the least cloud to obscure the clear light, darkness will overtake us sooner than we suppose. There is but one way by which we must enter into life, but one way by which we can reach it. The least deviation from these is a downward path to death. In addition to this, we,

by equivocating courses, assail the glory of Christ, which he has been pleased so to connect with our salvation, that he who detracts from the one violates both. Therefore we must, in asserting the doctrine of free Justification, give proof not only how dear our salvation, but also how precious the glory of Christ is to us. Hence it appears what a detestable end is plotted for us by those perfidious mediators, who, by their false glosses, would induce us not only to be ungrateful to the Son of God, but treacherous to our own salvation.

But granting that the doctrine of Justification by Faith alone were left to us entire, what place do those who leave us nothing but this think that the worship of God is to hold? Do they regard it as so frivolous a matter that it ought not to delay the peace of the Church? I say that it is to be preferred to the safety of men and angels! Those, therefore, who not only postponing, but even abandoning the worship of God, urge the other head only, have not yet learned what true Religion is. If any one objects, that a principal part of Divine Worship is comprehended in faith and its exercises, I admit it, but to debate about the mode in which men obtain salvation, and say nothing of the mode in which God may be duly worshipped, is too absurd.

We may add that the knowledge of this matter demands its own proper explanation. There are two principal branches. First, we must hold that the spiritual Worship of God does not consist either in external ceremonies, or any other kind of works whatsoever; and, secondly, that no Worship is legitimate unless it be so framed as to have for its only rule the will of him to whom it is performed. Both of these are absolutely necessary. For as we savour of nothing but earth and flesh, so we measure God by ourselves. Hence it is that we always take more pleasure in external show, which is of no value in the sight of God, than in that inward worship of the heart, which alone he approves and requires. On the other hand, the wantonness of our minds is notorious, which breaks forth, especially in this quarter, where nothing at all ought to have been dared. Men allow themselves to devise all modes of worship, and change and rechange them at pleasure. Nor is this the fault of our age Even from the

beginning of the world, the world sported thus licentiously with God. He himself proclaims that there is nothing he values more than obedience. (1 Sam. xv. 22.) Wherefore, all modes of worship devised contrary to his command, he not only repudiates as void, but distinctly condemns. Why need I adduce proofs in so clear a matter? Passages to this effect should be proverbial among Christians.

When our glossing mediators carelessly omit, and do not even make a single observation on the former branch, viz., that the Worship of God is spiritual, what else do they seek than some lurking place for deceit? Assume, however, that this may be tolerated. But when they class among works, good in themselves, those which are voluntarily undertaken, without any command from God, they pervert the whole rule of right and godly living. For what will become of the words, "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," (Matt. xv. 9,) if men may wander at will beyond the law of God?

They carry their effrontery so far as to say, that those who approve not of Works of Supererogation, are at variance with the Holy Spirit. Why so? Is it because the Spirit of God in Isaiah (Isaiah l. 12) commends works of this description, when he condemns those, which otherwise have the fairest appearance, on the single ground that God requires them not at our hands? I see their objection. To sell all, to practise perpetual virginity, to spend labour in preaching gratuitously for the Church, are not, indeed, commanded by the Lord, but nevertheless please him. My answer is, that though one were to do all these at once, and more than these, he would do no more than is contained in the law. For we are there ordered to love the Lord with all our heart. What man goes beyond this goal with his perfection? If they rejoin, that no special command is given concerning the works themselves, the answer to this is also easy. These things would neither be suitable for all, nor are they duly undertaken, as if they were valid in themselves, or as if God wished to be so worshipped. Should any one, not induced by any necessary cause, sell all that he has, and cast off the care of his family, as if selling were in itself a virtue, would he not justly be

convicted of folly? Christ does not address all indiscriminately when he says, "Go and sell all," (Matt. xix. 21,) but him who, falsely imagining that he had performed the whole law, was swollen with vain confidence. To shew him that he was still far from complete perfection, Christ touches the vice in which he was indulging, viz., excessive attachment to his riches. Whence it is plain that such a sale was comprehended under the commandments of the law.

The same thing may be said of Virginity. Every one ought to see what his gift is, lest labouring under incontinence, while he aspires to celibacy, he wrestle with God. And then he who is endued with the gift of continence, ought not to plume himself on his celibacy, as if he were leading a more perfect life than others. For neither is virginity praised as if it were a virtue in itself, but only in reference to its end, that freed from all avocations we may bestow our study and all our care more freely on the service of God.

And why did Paul refrain from taking stipend, but just to obviate the malice of false apostles, who asked none in order that they might throw a stigma on his ministry, or at least detract from his authority. In what respect, then, I ask, does a minister supererogate beyond the measure of his duty, when he omits nothing which he sees would conduce to the good of the Church? Paul could not have acted otherwise without exposing himself to the mockery of the wicked. What then did he do that, *first*, he ought not to have done; and that, *secondly*, was not prescribed by God?

They also put forward the example of David who danced before the ark. What has this to do with the establishment of fictitious modes of Worship? If David had it in his mind to establish some new worship, who can excuse his temerity in attempting a thing so strictly prohibited by the Lord? (Deut. xii. 8.) It was certainly a common law binding upon all that they were not to do as each pleased, but only as the Lord had commanded. If therefore David added anything of his own to the commandment, he improperly dared to do more than was lawful. If we admit that he sinned, what aid can a perverse example give to his imitators? I do not however concede that David danced with the intention of

exhibiting a worship not commanded him. It is well enough known that ceremonies were a species of exercises of piety, which were to be estimated not so much in themselves as in their end. What then did David mean by that dancing, but just to conduct the ark of the Lord with magnificence to the place divinely destined and consecrated for it? Although there is no doubt that he was led to this by a special inspiration of the Spirit, which is always to be observed in the extraordinary actings of the saints.

But lest any one should cavil and say, that we are too rigid in external matters when we thus expressly destroy all freedom, I would here protest to the pious reader that I am not now debating about Ceremonies which are only subservient to decency and order, or which are signs of and incitements to that reverence which we pay to God. We are disputing about works which the mediators pretend to be pleasing to God in themselves, and by which they affirm that he is duly worshipped. For when they talk of the righteousness of works, they obtrude fictions added at the will of man to the law of God. Who sees not that in this way the ἐθελοθρησκεία (will-worship) condemned by Paul is opposed to the commandment of God? I deny, therefore, that any worship of God is legitimate, save that which is required according to his will. That alone is termed reasonable by Paul, (Rom. xii. 1,) and on this simple ground, that when men would be wiser than they ought, they wander from reason and the right path. Of intermediate works, the choice of which is free, there will be a fitter opportunity of speaking elsewhere: I only wished to shew, that if works undertaken by us without the command of God are allowed to creep in and form part of divine worship and spiritual righteousness, the chief thing in religion is overthrown.

As our mediators in delivering a formula of Reformation, after they have treated of Justification, come down to the Church, we must see how far any pious man, who is unwilling to abandon the truth, may be permitted to acquiesce in their decrees. The marks which they set down for discerning the Church, viz., pure doctrine, the right use of the sacraments, and the holy unity thereon depending, I will-

ingly receive. But who perceives not that what they add about the Succession of Bishops is captiously said? We maintain, not without reason, that for several centuries the Church was so torn and dismantled, that it was destitute of true pastors. We maintain that those who assumed the title to themselves were nothing less than pastors. Our mediators not only insist on wolves being regarded as shepherds, but affirm that the Church is not to be sought anywhere else than among them.

We certainly deny not that the Church of God has always existed in the world; for we hear what God promises concerning the perpetuity of the seed of Christ. In this way, too, we deny not that there has been an uninterrupted succession of the Church from the beginning of the gospel even to our day; but we do not concede that it was so fixed to external shows—that it has hitherto always been, and will henceforth always be, in possession of the Bishops. And how, pray, do they prove this to be necessary? No promise can anywhere be found. Nay rather, when Peter admonishes us that there will be false teachers in the Church, as there were among the ancient people, (2 Pet. ii. 1,) and Paul declares that Antichrist will sit in the temple of God, (2 Thess. ii. 4,) they point not to foreign enemies who by violent irruption and for a little time disturb the Church: they speak of what is called the ordinary administration of Prelates, that no one might dream of a tranquil and flourishing state of the kingdom of Christ. Therefore, if the Church resides in the successors of the Apostles, let us search for successors among those only who have faithfully handed down their doctrine to posterity.

I know that this continuous Succession is extolled by Irenaeus, Origen, Augustine, and some other ancient writers. But it is mere imposition to attempt to employ their testimony in defence of the tyranny of the Papacy, which has nothing in common with the ancient form of the Church. Irenaeus and Origen had to do with base miscreants, who, while they advanced monstrous errors, gave out that they had received them by divine revelation. This falsehood was easily refuted, as many were still alive who had been fa-

miliar with the disciples of the Apostles. The remembrance of the doctrine which the Apostles had delivered was recent. The very walls, in a manner, still re-echoed with their voice. Is it strange that those holy men cited as witnesses the Churches which had both been constituted by the Apostles, and had, without controversy, retained their constitution? Augustine was contending with the Donatists, who, inflated with frantic pride, boasted that they alone possessed the Church, though there was no reason why they should dissent from others. Augustine objects to them, that the Churches which they repudiated, and from which they had become schismatics, had flowed in uninterrupted succession from the Apostles. This he did on the best grounds, as the Donatists acknowledged that these Churches had persevered in the doctrine which they had originally received.

Very different is our case: for we deny the title of Successors of the Apostles to those who have abandoned their faith and doctrine. Those perfidious mediators who confound light and darkness are not ignorant how unlike, or rather how contrary, the present perverted government is to the ancient government of the Church. What effrontery, then, is it to use the name of the Church herself as a cloak for oppressing the Church? Would that the Succession which they falsely allege had continued until this day: with us it would have no difficulty in obtaining the reverence which it deserves. Let the Pope, I say, be the successor of Peter, provided he perform the office of an Apostle. Wherein does Succession consist, if it be not in perpetuity of doctrine? But if the doctrine of the Apostles has been corrupted, nay, abolished and extinguished by those who would be regarded as their successors, who would not deride their foolish boasting? By the same kind of argument I might prove that all tyrants have been the best supporters of freedom, since there was an uninterrupted transition from the republic to their monarchy. Whether it now be so let fact determine. But our mediators purposely endeavour to prevent this estimate from being made, by raising a prejudice in favour of the doctrine from the honour which they bestow on the persons.

Briefly to conclude this part of our subject: We are in search of the Church of God. We all admit it to have been so propagated from the beginning, as to have continued through an uninterrupted series of ages down to our day, and to be diffused at present over the whole world. Another question remains, viz., Is it tied down to persons? Although we see how perilous it is to admit this, still we are unwilling to be so very solicitous in taking precautions for the future. But when the name of the Church is usurped by those who, as far as in them lay, have utterly destroyed it, how dastardly were it not to reclaim at least against the present evil? Hilarius, even in his time, said that the Church rather lurked in caverns than shone conspicuous in primary sees. What lamentations can suffice to deplore the fearful devastation which stalks abroad everywhere in the present day? The knowledge of the Church must therefore be sought elsewhere than from the titles of men; and in vain do we go round searching for it while the truest method spontaneously presents itself. Who of us, to recognise a man, would look at his shoes or his feet? Why then, in surveying the Church, do we not begin at its head, seeing that Christ himself invites us to do so? He says, "Where the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together." (Matt. xxiv. 28.) Wherefore, if we would unite in holding a unity of the Church, let it be by a common consent only to the truth of Christ.

When they come to the authority of the Church, whatever be the false colours with which our mediators delude the eyes of the ignorant, they are at last reduced to this, that instead of the word of God, human license alone is to prevail. Their threefold chime is well known. It belongs to the Church to discriminate between spurious and genuine Scriptures: she also has the right of interpreting Scripture: her traditions have the force of oracles. Where these foundations have been laid, it is plain that the power of which God has been robbed is transferred to horns and mitres. Be their conduct what it may, provided they are adorned with an episcopal title, they constitute the Church.

Moreover, boundless license will be given them, if they

are to interpret Scripture at will, frame Articles of Faith, and impose laws on the conscience. In such a case, what will be left for God? This is more than manifest treachery to the kingdom of Christ, sound doctrine, and our salvation. And will they cry out that we are fomenting discord, hindering and disturbing peace, if we do not forthwith assent? That it is the proper office of the Church to distinguish genuine from spurious Scripture, I deny not, and for this reason, that the Church obediently embraces whatever is of God. The sheep hear the voice of the shepherd, and will not listen to the voice of strangers. But to submit the sound oracles of God to the Church, that they may obtain a kind of precarious authority among men, is blasphemous impiety. The Church is, as Paul declares, founded on the doctrine of Apostles and Prophets; but these men speak as if they imagined that the mother owed her birth to the daughter.

The object they aim at is notorious. They refer to a Canon. *First*, I ask, at what time they suppose it to have been published? There is no mention of it in the Council of Nice; and yet the Holy Fathers then were armed with strong enough weapons against Arius, as they had the Scriptures in their hands. *Secondly*, What will become of the law and the prophetical books, if their authority continued in suspense till a decision was pronounced two thousand years after the law was given? They insist that the books of the Maccabees, Tobit, and others of the same stamp, are to be held authoritative, because they are contained in their vulgar Canon. But in regard to the Canon itself, which they so superciliously intrude upon us, ancient writers are not agreed. Let the mediators, then, enjoy their own as they please, provided we are at liberty to repudiate those which all men of sense, at least when informed on the subject, will perceive to be not of divine original.

Next comes the right of interpreting, in support of which, as belonging to their fancied Church, the mediators adduce the testimony of Peter, that no Scripture is of private interpretation, because the Prophets did not speak of themselves, but as they were impelled by the Holy Spirit. Their in-

ference will avail them little with intelligent men. Peter admonishes us that the prophecies can now be no more understood by the perspicacity of the human mind than they could at first have been composed by it. He therefore exhorts, that as they came down from heaven, so we should pray to have their genuine meaning opened to us by the Spirit of God. Nothing is to be given to ambition—nothing to arrogance. But does it thence follow that a right of interpreting has been conveyed to a few? They also bring forward, that the Spirit was promised to the Church to guide her unto all truth, and bring to mind whatever Christ had taught. But while they, in the mean time, rob the Church of what was given her by Christ, does not their deceit deserve to be exposed?

The Spirit of God furnishes the gift of interpretation to those to whom he thinks fit to give it for the common edification of the Church. The effect and use of this gift is not only suppressed but annihilated by those who give the bishops sole power to dictate to others what they must follow. It often happens that the bishops have no knowledge of the genuine meaning of Scripture. Then those who force us to abide by their injunctions, arm madmen with a sword by which they can miserably hack the whole of Scripture to pieces. In short, whosoever subjects the meaning of Scripture to the will of the bishops, kills the soul, and leaves nothing but a lifeless corpse. We must drag forth the snake which the mediators hide among the brambles. Their object is, that there may be nothing in Scripture so clear and strong as not to be evaded by one word, if it happens not to be agreeable to the horned herd.

The third part of ecclesiastical power our mediators place in the sanctuary of doctrines as well as laws. The former species they call Traditions, which, if any one disowns, he, in their opinion, denies that the Church is the foundation of the truth. By this trap miserable souls are ensnared, and dare not reject any superstition whatever which has prevailed for a long period of time. They, indeed, adduce a plausible example in the Baptism of Infants; but as there is no fiction too gross or childish to be vended in the Papacy under the

name of Tradition, whosoever has not the caution to keep out of this trap, voluntarily entangles himself in all kinds of superstition.

I do not, however, concede to them that Paedobaptism had its origin in the Tradition of the Church. It certainly appears to be founded on the institution of God, and to have derived its origin from circumcision. It would have little foundation if it depended only on the will of man. Accordingly, we must hold it as an universal rule, that no Sacrament is legitimate, unless it be of God and not of men. But to return to the present subject; not only the Blessing of the Pascal taper, the Exorcism of Water, and similar follies, which are of endless number, but the ritual of the Mass, and all the impious worship of this description, they make perfectly pure by a simple process, by merely giving them the name of Traditions, so that everything to which time has given a kind of prescriptive right is, as it were, placed beyond controversy, and holds up its head among the commandments of God. Will no man oppose this? Nay, rather a thousand times incur the obloquy of disturbing the peace, than by perfidious dissimulation betray the essential truth which is here endangered.

The true Church of Christ never passed any laws save such as might conduce to maintain order, cherish concord, and invigorate discipline. Such laws as every sober man will admit are rightly passed, and are to be observed by all pious men. Indeed, this is not the dispute. But it is necessary to provide against two evils, if we wish the Church to be safe. That the burdens imposed at the present day on Christians are no lighter, and not less numerous and diversified than those which the Jews of old sustained, it is impossible for any man to doubt, though the thing is expressly contrary to the ordination of Christ. He who abrogated divine laws, in order to release us from bondage, assuredly never meant that we should be oppressed by new laws of men. It has been done however. Not only has that liberal government been taken away, but souls have been forced as it were into a mere slaughter-house; at least the necessary result is, that they must be kept in a state of

constant torture. For some of them are openly repugnant to the prescribed rule of God, while the observance of others is impossible. Yet so far are those who hold the reins from curbing this tyranny, that their only thought is to establish it; and now our moderate men, by bringing forward the authority of the Church, make themselves the tools of this ungodly tyranny.

There is the other evil, the correction of which is not less necessary. The laws which the tyrants recommend under the name of the Church they term Spiritual, as being destined to rule the conscience. An appendage to this evil is the superstition which I mentioned, viz., their pretence that the observance of them pertains to the worship of God. But God claims spiritual government for himself alone, and for his word, that conscience untouched by man may learn to look only to his word. "There is one Lawgiver," says James, (James iv. 12,) "who is able to save and to destroy." And Paul strictly admonishes us, who have been set free by the benefit of Christ, not to enslave ourselves to men. (1 Cor. vii. 23.) In another place he rebukes the Colossians for being subject to decrees. (Col. ii. 20.) What do our mediators say? Without any mention of redress, they simply lay us under the necessity of obeying as heretofore. But whatever is given to men is so much abstracted from the authority of God. Have done then with that prevaricating obedience which breaks the bridle of God in order to strangle us with the cords of men!

Their appointing the Roman Pontiff over the whole Church, a thing intolerable in itself, is to be more keenly repelled because of the pretence that it was a privilege granted to Peter. Christ commands Peter to feed his sheep. What! does he not command the other Apostles likewise? But there must be some reason why Christ addresses him in these terms. As if it were not clear that by the thrice repeated command to feed the sheep, he was restored to the honour of the Apostleship from which he had fallen by thrice denying Christ. But with what modesty, I ask, do they interpret the name of "sheep" as applying to the whole Church? By the same argument I might hold that the office which

Christ bestowed upon him, he assigned to others, whom he exhorts to feed the flock of Christ. (1 Pet. v. 2.) According to them, Peter was to govern the whole Church, because it was said to him, "Feed my sheep." Therefore, when he writes that the same thing was to be rightfully done by others, he either confers on them the right bestowed upon himself, or he shares it equally along with them.

But they sport too wantonly with Scripture when they pretend that the whole Church is comprehended under the name of "sheep." He was indeed a shepherd of the sheep of Christ, that is, those of them on whom he bestowed his labour, and as far as his ministry could extend. For if he was to preside over all Churches with plenitude of power, as our mediators prate, Paul acted unjustly in denying him superior rank. But who ever heard tell of Peter having claimed anything for himself in regard to other strange Churches? Nay, rather, when he is sent by the Church, he obeys like any other one of the meeting. I deny not that he was distinguished among others, and that, because of the excellent gifts in which he excelled, the honour of the first place in all their meetings was assigned to him. But to have the command of the whole world is a very different thing from presiding over a small body of men.

But let us assume that all which they pretend was given to Peter: who can concede that it was given as a Patrimony which he might transmit to heirs? They say he left to successors the same right which he had received. Therefore, every one who is a successor of Peter must be Satan, since this epithet was applied to him! Where is there any mention of Succession? When Paul treats professedly of the whole administration of the Church, he neither appoints one head, nor makes the primacy hereditary; and yet in that place he is wholly intent on commending unity. After mentioning that there is one God the Father, one Christ, one Spirit, one body of the Church, one baptism, he describes the mode of preserving unity, viz., that to each of the pastors grace was distributed according to the measure bestowed upon them by Christ. Where is the plenitude of power when he refers each to a certain measure? Why did he not

immediately add one Pope? Nothing would have been more appropriate to the occasion had the fact been so.

Let us grant, moreover, that a perpetuity of Primacy in the Church was sanctioned in Peter. Why should the Seat of Primacy be found at Rome rather than elsewhere? The reason they allege is, that it was the See of Peter; just as if one were to place the principal See of the Jewish Church in the desert, because there Moses the greatest of Prophets, and Aaron the High-Priest, performed their office even till death. But let the reason be good. What of Antioch? They prefer Rome because Paul died there. But there are probable grounds for inferring that what they say of the Roman Episcopate of Peter is fabulous. Paul salutes several private individuals when he writes to the Church of Rome. Three years after he is carried thither a prisoner; Luke relates that he was received by the brethren;—still there is no mention of Peter. Paul writes various Epistles from prison: he mentions the names of certain persons of no mean rank;—there is no place for Peter among them. If he were there, such silence would be a marked insult! Then, when he complains that at his first defence no man stood by him, would he not affix the stigma of extreme perfidy on Peter if he was then the Pastor of the city? Again, when, in another place, he glances at all whom he had with him, who can believe that Peter was of the number? And yet this is almost the whole time which they assign to his Roman See.

But without raising that question, If Rome obtains the Primacy because it was Peter's last See, why does not Antioch hold the second place at least among the Patriarchates? Why were James and John, who appeared to be pillars along with Peter, unable to acquire the next dignity for their Sees? How preposterous was the mode of distribution, when they preferred Alexandria, the see of Mark, who was only one of the disciples, to Ephesus and Jerusalem? But I desist from comparing Apostles together. Where did the Lord and Master of all, before whose splendour all other dignity vanishes away, perform the office of High-Priest, both in teaching and dying, but at Jerusalem? Shall Jeru-

salem then be no See of Christ, and Rome seize upon the honour? To this we add, that the apostleship of Peter was specially to the Jews, as Paul testifies, and therefore properly has no reference to us. Let us leave it to the Jews, then, whose question it is, to debate about this succession.

With the same modesty they produce Cyprian as a witness in this cause—Cyprian, who charges Bishops with tyrannical pride if they arrogate to themselves any authority over their colleagues! He indeed commends one bishopric, but it is the bishopric of Christ, of which each bishop holds a part *in solidum*, as he expresses it. But he afterwards states that schisms arose from contempt of the Chief Priest. See their ingenuousness! What Cyprian says of the Levitical priesthood they wrest to the Papacy. For, if Cyprian regarded all as schismatics who refuse to submit to the Roman Pontiff, what place is he himself to occupy after having inveighed so freely against Stephen, not only charging him with ignorance and arrogance, but forcing him back into his proper place, as if he were one of the common herd? Wherefore, let them here cease so impudently to abuse the testimony of God and man.

But it is a useful means of removing dissension, they say, that there be one of eminence whom all are compelled to obey. Of this, then, let them leave the Church at liberty to consult; and let them not pretend that an appointment which ought to be made on grounds of expediency was prescribed by God. But even this expediency is falsely pretended, especially while the plenitude of power of which they boast breaks out into licentiousness, and can no more be separated from tyranny than the fire can be separated from its own heat. And not to continue longer here, if plenary power over the Christian world is nothing else than an Universal Bishopric, Gregory everywhere denounces it as nefarious and blasphemous, and fit only for Antichrist! To whom shall we give credit on the subject of the Papacy more readily than to a Pope? Let the Roman Pontiff now plume himself as he will on this authority which flatterers ascribe to him: with men of sense he will do no more than shew himself to be Antichrist!

Now, to leave everything else, if they wish the Roman Pontiff to be recognised as Head of the whole Church, they must, in the first place, give us a true bishop; for who is to have pre-eminence among bishops but one, and an excellent one in the order of bishops? They themselves, when they would deck out the Papacy, have ever in their mouths the Succession of Peter and Vicegerency of Christ. Will our mediators then have the audacity to give the name of Christ's Vicar to one who, after routing the truth of Christ, extinguishing the light of the gospel, overthrowing the salvation of men, corrupting and profaning the worship of God, and trampling down and tearing to pieces all his sacred institutions, domineers like a barbarian? What resemblance, I ask, has the Pope to Christ, that he should be his substitute and representative? What has his tyranny in common with the ministry of Peter, that he should be deemed Peter's successor? Therefore, in order to our coming to an agreement concerning the Primacy, we must set out with insisting that he on whom we confer the first place in the Church shall prove himself to be truly a bishop. For he who lays it down as the bond of unity, that, be the Roman Bishop what he may, the whole world should be subject to him, can never gain his point in any other way than by stirring up an impious revolt from Christ.

In the Sacraments our worthy and impartial pacificators shew this much moderation, that the number seven, which was rashly devised by the presumption of unlearned men, and crept in through the foolish credulity of the world, is to be retained as sacred. I must ever be entreating my readers to reflect on the weight and magnitude of the cause under discussion. Christ instituted the Sacraments to be not only symbols of the true religion, which might distinguish the children of God from the profane, but also evidences, and therefore pledges of the divine favour toward us. In Baptism, both forgiveness of sins and the spirit of regeneration are offered to us; in the Holy Supper we are invited to enjoy the life of Christ along with all his benefits. Where are we to stop if with these the fictions of men are intermingled?

They pretend, indeed, that God is the author of the whole.

This subject will be discussed afterwards. At present, I only say that we shall be dastardly indeed if we allow any Ceremonies whatsoever, the offspring of human brains, to be put on a footing with those solemn mysteries in which the sum of our salvation is contained. When Christ asks, whether the Baptism of John was from heaven or of men? (Matt. xxi. 25,) he intimates, that it was not to be regarded as legitimate and binding if it was not of divine appointment. The same holds good in all the Sacraments. And, indeed, while these mediators profess that the Sacraments not only attest but exhibit things above the reach and faculty of men, it is plain that the perverseness is extreme which would subject them to the will of men. That two Sacraments were committed to us by Christ is undisputed. Of the other five, then, let us see what we ought to think.

Before proceeding, however, it may be worth while briefly to observe in regard to Baptism that what they say of its absolute necessity might better have been omitted. For, besides tying down the salvation of men to external signs, no small injustice is done to the promise, as if it were unable to give the salvation which it offers unless its sufficiency were aided from another quarter. The offspring of believers is born holy, because their children, while yet in the womb, before they breathe the vital air, are included in the covenant of eternal life. Nor, indeed, are they admitted into the Church by baptism on any other ground than that they belonged to the body of Christ before they were born. He who admits any others to baptism profanes it. Now, then, when they make baptism to be so necessary that they exclude all who have not been dipped with it from the hope of salvation, they both insult God and also involve themselves in great absurdity. For how could it be lawful to put the sacred impress of Christ on strangers? Baptism must, therefore, be preceded by the gift of adoption, which is not the cause merely of a partial salvation, but bestows salvation entire, and is afterwards ratified by baptism.

Hence, as error usually springs from error, the office of baptizing, which Christ committed to the Ministers of the Church alone, they delegate not to any common individual

among the people, but to silly women. I do not notice that when discussing the form of baptism they postpone the explanation of the doctrine as if it were of little moment, and insist on the bare pronunciation of the words: as if Christ, when he ordered his Apostles to baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, had dictated some kind of magical charm, and not rather meant summarily to indicate whence the whole efficacy of baptism flows, in whose name and by whose order it is administered, on what faith it depends, and to what end it ought to be referred.

All the Ceremonies by which posterity has partly vitiated, partly obscured, the pure Baptism of Christ, they order to be left untouched; nay, if they have been anywhere abolished they are to be restored. What else is this than to soil the heavenly laver of Christ with the muddy impurities of man? Christ commanded the simple symbol of water. With it, as was right, the Apostles were contented. The same soberness did not prevail with their successors. They became delighted with the oil and the taper and similar follies. At length, as is usual, perverse superstition crept in, and the chrism added by man was considered of more value than the water consecrated by Christ! The water itself behoved to be consecrated by a new and showy rite, as if it were otherwise profane. In short, the act of baptizing has been compounded of so many various parts that the symbol of water, which alone ought to have been conspicuous, is lost among the crowd.

Our superstitious masters allege that these additions serve to adorn Baptism, but the fact proclaims that the pure administration of it is rather obscured. There was need at least of some correction. Our mediators, so far from admitting this, distinctly provide that nothing is to be touched. Let this much be granted to ancient custom, that things which are not only superfluous, but useless, may be tolerated. But what if any are found to be absurd and ridiculous, and little suited to the dignity of the ordinance? They will themselves be forced to admit that of this sort is the spittle with which they moisten the infant's lips. Christ anointed the mouth of the dumb man, whose speech he was about to

restore, with spittle. How preposterous the imitation which tries the same thing on infants! Is it thus that the miracles of Christ behove to be commemorated? This mockery, (whence or when it arose is unknown, but it certainly has no authority of weight,) when they obstinately defend, do they not plainly shew that their object is not to leave us one spark of light?

In treating of the Supper they bring back the fiction of Transubstantiation, against which all are forced to protest who are unwilling that the true use of the Supper should be lost to them. A common property of the Sacraments is, that in a manner adapted to the human intellect they exhibit what is spiritual by a visible sign. The spiritual meaning of the Supper is, that the flesh of Christ is the meat and his blood the drink on which our souls are fed. Unless the sign correspond to this the nature of the Sacrament is destroyed. It is therefore necessary that the bread and wine be held forth to us, that from them we may learn what Christ sets before us in figure. But if the bread which we see is an empty show, what will it attest to us but an empty shadow of the flesh of Christ? They pretend that there is only an appearance of bread, which deceives the eye. How far will this phantom carry us? Believers, in order to recognise the true feeding of the soul, must therefore stop at the sign which corresponds to the body on which they are to feed. In short, the object of the Sacraments is to effect, by an analogy between the sign and the thing signified, a kind of transition from the bodily sense to the understanding mind.

What do our worthy moderators say? You are mistaken in thinking you taste bread and wine. That which was bread has ceased to be so, and nothing remains but a *spectrum!* Of what thing then will it be to me a symbol? To make the matter plainer, let us borrow a similitude from Baptism. Should any one deny that what we are there washed with is water, will not the whole reality of baptism immediately vanish? For who can persuade himself that he has the washing of regeneration if he finds nothing of the kind in the sign? Therefore, in order that the Sacrament may be beneficial to us, we must never allow ourselves to be

driven from this position, which is also confirmed by several strong passages of Scripture—that the bread which is broken among us is the *κοινωνίαν* (communion) of the body, and that, in like manner, the wine is the communion of the blood of Christ.

In addition to the clear testimony of Scripture we have the consent of the Primitive Church. Nothing is more certain than that this dream, which did not come into the mind of any man for more than six hundred years, suddenly emerged, like a kind of abortion, from brawling sophists; and yet so strong was the belief of the analogy I have mentioned, between the sign and the thing signified, that it was at first exploded. Several years afterwards passed away, during which barbarism increased, and, along with the study of all good arts, a purer religion became obsolete. This was Satan's opportunity for again introducing the scouted doctrine. And yet in almost all ages have there been men of sound minds, who did not disguise their dissatisfaction, but declared it not only freely by their voice, but also by their writings.

But granting that the error has been confirmed by a remote antiquity, we are strictly bound by the words of Christ not to dare to subscribe to any human decrees which would set us at variance with them. Christ orders us to take and eat bread. This is the most serious act of all. A promise is added, which cannot have effect unless we truly eat bread. For the analogy I have mentioned must always be retained,—that, as the body is nourished by bread and wine, so the flesh of Christ is the food, and his blood the drink of the soul. We, therefore, obeying the command of Christ, at the same time also embrace the promise, not doubting but that the secret virtue of the Spirit will effect within us that which bread signifies to the eye. Those worthy men who assume the part of pacificators, assert a fictitious metamorphosis, which is nowhere mentioned in Scripture, with as much superciliousness as if an hundred messages had been sent from heaven to confirm it.

We say that we cannot lawfully depart from the exact words of Christ. What cause is there for their being so

fierce against the reverence which we thus pay to Christ, that on this single charge they pronounce us heretics? For not contented with the simple ordinary condemnation, they calumniously accuse us of questioning the omnipotence of Christ, and charging him with foolishness, as if we were here disputing about the power of Christ, and not rather searching for the meaning of the ordinance in his word. That all things are to be changed by Christ, we too admit. But should any one from this infer that heaven is changed into earth, he will be a ridiculous estimator of the divine power, destroying the whole order of nature as fixed and established by God, to substitute monstrosities in its stead. Thus, in this question, they trouble themselves to no purpose in seeking what Christ can do, when the only point which ought to occupy all our thoughts is, what does Christ will? But his will can only be ascertained by his word. Let them then produce one syllable in evidence of this alleged transmutation. Not one can be found. Nothing then can be more futile than the calumny by which they bring us into contest with the power of Christ, a contest which has no existence.

When they say that we charge Christ with foolishness, how mightily do they lie? Christ declares, that he gives his body and his blood by holding forth bread and wine. All this we receive, and doubt not that he will make good his promise, which, however, cannot be made good unless the thing itself be exhibited. But thus it is. In comparison with their prodigies they value as nothing whatever has proceeded from the mouth of Christ, and explains the whole force of the ordinance, and contains the whole effect of the spiritual grace in which faith acquiesces. Here, without enumerating the endless absurdities, or rather monstrous errors, which this Transubstantiation has produced, who that is at all pious, and duly instructed in the school of Christ, does not detest it, even on this account—that while the Supper of Christ has the property of raising us to heaven, no sooner is the persuasion settled in our minds that the bread is changed into the body of Christ, than our thoughts, which ought to have risen to heaven, are immediately bent down to earth? Christ invites us to himself.

As we cannot climb so high, he himself lends us his hand, and assists us with the helps which he knows to be suited to us, and even lifts us to heaven, as it is very appropriately expressed by those who compare the Sacraments to ladders. Suppose now, as these men insist, that what is seen on the sacred table is not bread but Christ inclosed, who will not remain fixed down both in mind and body to earth, when he thinks he possesses Christ? In this way the sign which ought to have employed each bodily sense in raising the mind above the heavens, keeps it bound by the bodily senses under the elements of the world. Here I only express what has notoriously happened. How few will be found in the Papacy who do not gaze so stupidly on the outward sign as to forget that Christ is to be sought amid the glories of heaven!

To this gross stupor a still worse superstition is annexed. For where is Christ adored except in the bread? But if the authority of Scripture prevailed with us, we would think so magnificently of his celestial glory, that we would not allow ourselves to have any carnal or earthly thought of him. Though we may deem preposterous adoration of Christ a light fault, it will not cease to be regarded by God and angels as execrable sacrilege. Thanks, however, to our moderators for speaking out their sentiments freely. They might have deceived by silence. But when they assert that Christ is properly adored in the Sacrament, their words admonish us what we shall have to do if we subscribe to their decrees.

I certainly admit that Christ is to be worshipped wherever we are; and in the Supper, where he offers himself to be enjoyed by us, he cannot be duly received unless he be adored. But the question is, Whether is our adoration to look upwards or downwards? Moreover, as nothing is done there that is not heavenly, though it be done on earth, if we would prepare ourselves for receiving with benefit, our minds must be raised higher than the earth and the world. Then, while Christ is seated in heavenly glory, any one who turns in a different direction to adore him departs from him. And what meaning will there be in the ancient preamble, "Sursum Corda," which the Papists still chant in their masses, if

our worship cleaves to the earth? But when men have once entered a labyrinth, the result must always be, that as they proceed they get more and more entangled. Therefore, if we would adore Christ as we ought, we must lay aside all earthly thoughts of him. In this way, when celebrating the Supper, we shall indeed worship him as present, but with minds upraised to heaven, whither faith calls us, not fixed down on the bread, which were not less at variance with the right rule of faith, than with the glorious majesty of Christ.

Then as to their saying that after the Supper is finished, the body of Christ, nevertheless, remains, as long as the consecrated bread is preserved, this behoved to be added to make them consistent in error. For whither could the body of Christ fly away, after once the bread had taken its place? But what kind of religion should we say those have who assent to such vile absurdities, unless, indeed, it be mere pretence? For who that is not plainly fascinated by the devil will desire more in the Sacrament than the promises contain?

Let us now weigh the words of Christ. He certainly does not address the bread, and bid it become his body. The bread, therefore, is not for himself, nor is the body in himself, but for us, inasmuch as it is offered to us for a spiritual symbol. Then, while the command and the promise cohere to each other, it is not for us to put asunder what the Son of God hath joined. But what does he say? Before promising us his body and blood, he orders us to take, eat, and drink. Now, if the communion which he enjoins be taken away, what place will there be for the promise annexed to it? Christ, I say, extends to us his body, but it is to be eaten; he holds forth his blood, but it is to be drunk. The whole force of the consecration, therefore, is directed to us, not to the bread or the wine; and indeed to us, as obeying the command of Christ.

This reference may be illustrated by a similitude. Paul declares, (1 Cor. x. 3, 4,) that the manna was spiritual food, and that the water which flowed from the rock was, in like manner, the same spiritual drink as ours. The words are clear. The fathers were partakers, though under different

signs, of the same Christ with ourselves. But who ever heard that the pot of manna which was reserved was worshipped by the pious? Nay, though the Jews were carried, with a kind of frantic impetus, to all kinds of idolatry, none of them ever thought of such a thing. What if, during the eating, any part of the body of Christ should have fallen, or been trampled upon? What! when more than the proper quantity had been collected, and it became putrid, did the body of Christ become tainted? Should any one have employed that water in washing away impurities, would the blood of Christ have been soiled? That which was carried away to the crevices of the ground, that which the cattle drank—(for they had no other watering-place)—what was it but water? We thus see that nothing lies under signs, except with reference to those to whom the signification belongs. In like manner we refute their prattle about adoration. For though Paul declares that the rock was Christ, the Israelites were not so stupid as to prostrate themselves before it.

But to return to the subject in hand: Our mediators insist that, after consecration, the body of Christ always remains, independently of its use in the Supper. If conjectures are to be admitted, it is certainly probable that, when our Lord celebrated the first Supper with the Apostles, some fragment of the bread remained over, and we do not read that he who received the cup last drank the whole: for they were all ordered to drink of the cup, not to drink it out. It might thus have happened that the blood of Christ was swallowed by some random guest. What! when one loaf was broken in the primitive Church, will they say that the remains were set aside in a cupboard? No; they had not yet learned the new wisdom, which feigns that the bread is changed by magical incantation. Let us, then, adhering to the words of Christ himself, acknowledge that his body is no more exhibited to us by the bread, than the grace of God is without his promises. He says that he gives his body, not to be kept shut up in a cupboard, but to be distributed among the faithful.

The use of the cup, as those who have been accustomed to it cannot easily be kept from it, is conceded to them by

way of indulgence, and under condition that they are not to find fault with the practice which has been long in use, of communicating under one kind. The privilege they are to enjoy till such time as a decree of the Council lets them understand what is to be done. What will be stable in religion, if we subject the ordinances of the Son of God to abrogation at the will of men? The command is clear, "DRINK YE ALL OF IT." They evade this by the puerile cavil, that Christ spoke thus to the Apostles alone, whom he had already made priests: as if he were not prescribing a common rule for all. What! did he institute a special Sacrament for priests and not rather for the whole Church? If there were any doubt on the subject, Paul removes it when he declares that he delivered to the Corinthians, male and female, that which he had received of the Lord, viz., that ALL, WITHOUT EXCEPTION, WERE TO DRINK. Can a better interpretation be desired?

It is notorious that this mode of Communicating, as delivered by the Lord, was practised in the Church for more than seven hundred years. Nay, an edict of Gelasius is extant, which excommunicates those who abstain from the cup and take the other part. "Let them," says he, "be kept from the whole, or let them take the whole: they cannot take the ordinance thus divided without great sacrilege." To this sacrilege which Gelasius so much detests, men have dared to break forth not only by a superstitious obstinacy, but by a tyrannical prohibition. What pious mind does not shudder at this diabolical audacity?

The pretexts used to defend it only double the evil. As some drops of the blood might occasionally be spilled, they allege that it was to obviate this danger. Thus, if we believe them, they alone have observed that for which the eternal wisdom of God failed to provide. The mistake committed by it they behove to correct. We have already obviated the danger by disposing of the false idea of magical exoreism; but yet though a thousand dangers impended, I maintain that it would not be lawful to make any change in the perpetual and inviolable edict of Christ.

They allege that Christ is received whole under the bread,

because he cannot be divided. The refutation of this quibble is also easy. Christ is entire in himself, but still so that he can communicate himself to us according to the measure of our faith. It is certainly not without cause that He offers his body to us under the bread, and his blood under the wine: for he in this manner testifies that he is our whole food, which consists of meat and drink. Christ enjoins us not to seek a part of life only, but our whole life in him. And as he knows that for this we need some assistance, he holds forth to us the symbols of meat and drink. In holding forth the bread, he declares that his flesh will be our meat, and he adds the cup to intimate that in his blood we have spiritual drink. Now, when men interpose and give out that one part is amply sufficient for us, as Christ cannot be divided, are they to be listened to while so openly subverting the ordinance? And, indeed, by so acting they as much as in them lies divide Christ, while they fear not to separate those sacred badges of his body and blood, which he has joined by an inseparable tie.

They say that he who has Christ whole under this species of bread, ought to be contented with it. But seeing that he communicates his body and his blood to us separately under two symbols, we shall not be contented till we have the whole which he himself has given. For he who allows men to restrict it to a half, *in the first place*, derogates as much from Christ; and, *in the second place*, by lacerating the ordinance, deprives himself of its fruit and virtue. And we must boldly repudiate the language of certain crafty men, who tell us, that as it is an external matter, it is not much worth the fighting for. While they butcher so many innocent men for the worship of their idol, whence does this talk of so much moderation suddenly arise? In vindicating the badge of the blood by which we have been redeemed, let us not, if need be, spare our own blood!

To make out Confirmation to be a Sacrament, they pretend that it differs not from the laying on of hands which Luke relates that the Apostles used. If this is true, how will they shew their license to make that common and promiscuous which was destined for certain persons only. We do

not read that the Apostles laid hands upon all, but that they used this symbol only in distributing the gifts of the Holy Spirit. That these were common to all, even they themselves do not allege. There will, therefore, be this difference, that a Sacrament which the Apostles bestowed on certain men only, our new mediators expose to all alike. Then when they confess that Chrism has been superadded, whereas the Apostles only used the laying on of hands, who do they think will be persuaded that men have obtained the power of exhibiting any gift of the Spirit which it pleases them to figure? After enumerating the seven, they tell us that each of them effects what it figures. Therefore, if men are at liberty to bring forth a Sacrament without authority from the word of God, that which God claims for himself alone has been subjected to their will.

Besides, their doctrine is repugnant to the very definition of a Sacrament. They will not deny that the end proposed by the Sacraments is to be a kind of seals to us in confirming the promises of God in our minds. Where, then, is the use of a Sacrament, if it seals no promise? But none can be found which they can fit to their Confirmation. In the Sacraments we seek proof of the Divine favour towards us—proof which none but God himself can furnish. What is there of this nature in Confirmation? In short, as the public stamp distinguishes genuine coin from spurious, so, wherever I do not see the word of God engraven, there I will confidently object that a Sacrament is falsely alleged.

I hear what our moderators advance on the other side. All the promises which we have concerning the gift of the Spirit they accommodate to Confirmation. But it is to take far too much license to themselves to restrict what God promises simply to any whatever of their ceremonies. Simple and disencumbered of any sign are the words which I have from the lips of Christ—that his Spirit will be continually present with believers. Those men pretend that they have the Spirit inclosed in oil as in a kind of box, and that he is brought out by their unction. Meanwhile, the promises which they thus misapply they pretend to found upon, that they may not seem to speak without reason.

But since the Church believes thus, they tell us that, if we think differently, we must deny her to be the pillar of the truth—an atrocious crime, if it were real! But as they assume the name of the Church, not less falsely than arrogantly, over what else do they insult than the ever-oppressed truth? And the better to betray their barbarian ferocity, they call that so oft-exploded fiction of septiform grace the faith of the Church, of which none may lawfully doubt.

Isaiah enumerates six gifts of the Spirit with which he teaches that Christ would be endued. (Isaiah xi. 2.) How a seventh has been added in the common version, I know not. As if some sublime mystery had been beneath, septiform grace was coined out of it. But, first, the number seven originated in mistake. Secondly, to say nothing of this, what equity will there be in forcing the Spirit of God, as it were, into a corner, and confining him to seven effects, when he is elsewhere called the Spirit of truth and holiness, and grace, and prayer, and adoption, and is here invested by the Prophet with six titles? If either our ingratitude or blindness of our eyes is so great that the goodness of our cause is overwhelmed by unjust prejudices, there will certainly be more justice in posterity, who will recognise how furiously those wolves who arrogate the name of shepherds have preyed on the innocent sheep of Christ.

There is nothing so absurd, nothing so foul, as not to get wiped by this one towel—the Church, which is the best Interpreter of Scripture, thinks so. Thus, when they assign the right of Confirming to bishops only, they add, that this was approved by the consent of the whole Church; that is, if such consent is to be estimated by their caprice. But here they act still more unworthily. They fear not to allege the practice of the Apostles. As there are only three passages in Luke where he relates that the Spirit was given by this ceremony, (Acts viii. 17, ix. 17, xix. 6,) he testifies that hands were laid on Paul himself by Ananias, just as they were on others by Paul, John, and Peter. What bishopric will they give to Ananias that he may not be said to have seized on another's office? And yet they cry out that we are heretics if we do not assent to their convicted

falsehoods! Nay, when they substitute common priests for bishops, in case of necessity, (on which subject their Canons contain an epistle of forgery,) they shew that that apostolical practice which they play before our eyes is by no means held to be their law.

Still, however, the laying on of hands, they say, is to be observed: for if it is not to be believed that the Apostles used it without command from Christ, their observance of it is equivalent to a law to us. To this they add, that it was not a vain symbol. Hence they infer that it ought to be considered as a Sacrament. I admit both positions; but our mediators, not considering what ought not to have been omitted, viz., of what thing it was a Sacrament, ignorantly make that perpetual which was temporary.

It is notorious that the Gifts of the Spirit, which were then given by the laying on of hands, some time after ceased to be conferred. Whether this was owing to the ingratitude of the world, or because the doctrine of the Gospel had already been sufficiently distinguished by the miracles of nearly an hundred years, is of no consequence to the present subject. All see that the thing which the Apostles indicated by that rite was taken away. To what end, then, since the reality has received its accomplishment, will the sign be prolonged? Should any one in the present day attempt to introduce the practice of lying on the dead, because Elisha and Paul, on good authority, used the symbol in raising the dead, who would not at once repudiate the preposterous imitation? We therefore deny not that it was a Sacrament to the Apostles, but we hold it to be one which was abrogated when the reality was taken away. Wherefore, if our mediators wish to retain the use of it, let them first restore the thing signified.

But though I admit that after Miracles had ceased, the practice of laying on of hands was nevertheless retained by the primitive Church, we ought not to be considered as thus prejudiced, unless a distinct authority from Scripture can be produced. Besides, our mediators give a very different reason from that of the early Christians. For while Augustine acknowledges that it is nothing but a solemn symbol of

prayer, they in vain endeavour to hide themselves under the shadow of those from whom they so widely differ.

We also should like to see that rite everywhere restored by which the young are presented to God, after giving forth a Confession of their Faith. This would be a not unbecoming approval of their Catechism. But however pious and useful some ordinances of men may be, they must sink far beneath the honour of Sacraments, which were divinely delivered to us, and have comprehended in them the covenant of eternal salvation.

Now, however, Unction cannot be received without those appendages which all the pious ought justly to abhor. For what is less to be borne than that Confirmation should be preferred to Baptism, and be called a worthier Sacrament, and be regarded with greater veneration? Our mediators indeed craftily disguise these foul blasphemies, but as they necessarily accompany the oil, what do they aim at by such silence, but just to murder us unaware? Unction, according to them, proceeded from the Church. But it is the same Church, if we believe them, which introduced those meretricious glosses for the purpose of adorning her cause. If we assent, will not Christ justly upbraid us with making void the commandments of God through human traditions? And what is the commandment of God that will thus be spurned? Baptism, the washing of regeneration, by which we put on Christ—Baptism, the testimony of our adoption, the entrance into the kingdom of God, ablution in the blood of Christ, the commencement of new and eternal life, will yield to oil trodden out in the press of men. And shall we be judged Christians, if not only by our silence, but by open suffrage, we give room for so iniquitous a comparison?

The Council of Aurelium decreed that all who had been baptized were to be Confirmed, in order to be found full Christians! for it denies them to be Christians until they are anointed with Episcopal oil. Our mediators take it for granted that this is a decree of the Church. What then will become of the Apostles and martyrs who were never oiled? Nay rather, what will become of us if we long for any other Christianity than that which Apostles and martyrs had?

This dogma, which wrenches us away from their society, is not so affronting to them as fatal to ourselves.

Another diabolical sentiment broached by the Council our mediators expressly confirm, though they speak somewhat more modestly. But what matters it, seeing that both look to the same end? The sum is, that we are Regenerated to life in Baptism, but are equipped for battle by Confirmation! What else is this than to strip baptism of one half of its efficacy? For if we therein put on Christ, if we are ingrafted into the likeness of his death, so that being dead to the world and the flesh, we rise again to newness of life, which is to endure for ever—who sees not that our mediators transfer what was contained under baptism to their own fictitious Unction? Our part, therefore, is to expose our life an hundred times, rather then silently and dissemblingly allow our baptism to be thus rent asunder.

The Sacrament of Penance we have already in some measure discussed, when treating of Confession. At present I will only remark, that atrocious insult is offered to God, when the name of Sacrament is given to the kind of Absolution which they pretend to be necessary. I mention not that a destructive snare is laid for consciences, when confession is prescribed as necessary to obtain forgiveness of sins. This has been already said elsewhere. But when they insist that the reconciliation of man with God shall be sealed by the ceremony of Absolution, I say that they do a thing too arrogant for men to do! Where did they get the license to fabricate a sign at their own hands, and then order it to be a pledge to sanction salvation? God promises us the forgiveness of sins. Of the ceremony there is not one word. These men send us away to a priest, who by a wave of his hand is to declare to us that our sins are forgiven—as if they had the power of affixing the efficacy of Christ's death to their decrees. Therefore, as we value the forgiveness of sins, so must we earnestly contend that the belief of it shall not be suspended on a rite humanly devised.

As we acknowledge the Anointing which the Apostles used in Curing the Sick to have been a Sacrament, so we deny that it belongs to us, because, like the grace to which

it was subservient, it was temporary. All know that the gift of healing was not perpetual. It is one of those things by which God was pleased to distinguish the new preaching of the gospel until it should gain credit in the world. Accordingly, we can gather from ancient historians that it was shortly after taken away. In a matter so notorious and confessed, it were superfluous to adduce evidence. What then do our mediators mean? If they pretend that the gift which the Apostles denoted by the symbol of oil, lasted beyond their age, they will be convicted of the vilest effrontery. Now, there is a common axiom, that "the accessory follows the nature of the principal," and therefore I conclude, that after the thing was taken away it is not only in vain to retain the sign, but it is to sport with too serious a matter. In order to be true imitators of the Apostles they must be endued with the gift of healing. And while not possessing it they nevertheless usurp the sign, they are nothing but apes.

But James the brother of the Lord not only gives evidence in favour of this Unction, but also celebrates it by his own promulgation. For here their rhetorical vehemence waxes very boisterous. I willingly assent to the words of James, (James v. 14,) but I deny it to have been his intention to prostitute what he knew to be an efficacious sign representing divine grace, to a frigid imitation. It is certain that the anointers of this day are no more ministers of the grace of which James speaks than the player who acted Agamemnon on the stage was a king.

They allege that the grace which Christ here holds forth is despised. But what is that grace? Those whom the Apostles anointed they at the same time cured. So Mark testifies. (Mark iii.) Now, however, none are anointed but the dying, so that when any one afterwards recovers, they are not far from thinking that the unction has been profaned. And our moderators repeat the caution not to apply the oil till death is evidently approaching. But let them answer me: When James assigns this relief to the sick indiscriminately, how dare they restrict it to perilous and mortal diseases? If the authority of James is of such weight

with them, why do they hesitate not to depart from it? But allowing them to use this license with impunity, with what face do they bring forward James, whose words expressly overthrow what they would establish? He declares that the sick man will be relieved. How many recover health by the oil? Scarcely one in a hundred lives after unction. Nay, they do not administer it to cure their sickness, but to send them fatter to the grave. And still they charge us with cruelty for refusing this most admirable solace to the sick; as if one was ever seen who had experienced any benefit from it. I omit the many frivolities with which this histrionic unction is accompanied, nay, the impious superstitions with which it is stuffed, for I have said enough already to demonstrate their folly.

The Laying on of Hands, by which Ministers are consecrated to their office, I do not quarrel with them for calling a Sacrament. But that this appellation should be applied to what they call the seven orders, as they have hitherto been received in the Papacy, and our mediators approve, I hold to be not at all agreeable to reason. Nay, what they affirm of the priesthood is nugatory, viz., that the honour and authority of it are conferred on all whom bishops ordain. First, it is well known to what end men are ordained in the Papacy, viz., in order to sacrifice. For the formal chant of inauguration bears, that power is given them to offer Sacrifices pleasing to God: though they cannot shew that anything of this kind was commanded by Christ.

Although the discussion of this matter will be better deferred to the proper place, it is easy by a single word to overthrow their pretended priesthood. When bishops, without any authority from God, appoint individuals to offer sacrifices, by what right will they cause the Holy Spirit to descend upon them? I wholly deny that the Papal priesthood is founded on a divine call. How then can I dignify the ceremony by which they are ordained with the name of Sacrament?

Moreover, when our glossing mediators insinuate a Perpetual Succession, we must again withstand their craftiness. They insist that all presbyters are to be deemed legitimate

who have been ordained by horned bishops, and they exclude all from the ministry who have not been ordained by their hands. In the former case, indeed, they go much farther, and, as if they were making new creatures, pretend that an indelible character is imprinted by the benediction of the bishop.

It is worth while to observe what the rite is for imprinting this character. As Christ by breathing gave a sign of the Spirit whom he was bestowing on the Apostles, so their bishops, as if they were blowing out the Holy Spirit from their throats, emulate the example of Christ after their fashion, in other words, preposterously. There is another thing also which they borrow from the Mosaic law, viz., anointing the fingers. But who taught them to bring back into use what Christ abrogated by his advent? In this matter they are not only destitute of precept, but they cannot without falsehood even pretend the countenance of antiquity. Both are novel inventions unknown to antiquity.

If the right of the Priesthood in which they glory is founded on a Perpetual Succession from the Apostles, let its origin first be investigated. I have already mentioned their principal ceremony, and I deny it to have the authority of the Apostles. Their priesthood, therefore, fails at the very beginning, or rather is far distant from the beginning which they would assign to it.

But to come to the fountainhead, how often in many places has their Succession been interrupted? Over how many Churches do their histories tell that heretics presided? Almost all Germany twice before our day abandoned the Roman See: once when Presbyters were forced to put away their wives, and a second time when Gregory VII., in his hostility to the Emperor Henry IV., sought to withdraw the Germans from him by fulminating at them. I omit more recent examples which will readily occur to the well-informed reader. Who, moderately versant in history, does not know that three Antipopes distracted the Church by their factions? Two of them at least appointed several bishops, and those again ordained presbyters. Where is the continuous Succession?

But, omitting these, it will be necessary to leap over

Popess Joan, if they would continue their series from the Apostles! If ancient annals are examined we shall find that many primary Sees were occupied by heretics. They gain nothing by concealing all these interruptions.—To return to more recent times. Until they prove the Council of Basle not to be legitimate, I shall always maintain that there is not an individual among the whole Popish clergy who is not schismatical. They all derive their origin from Eugenius, whom the Council not only deposed from the Papacy, but condemned with all his followers, as guilty of heresy and schism. I am aware of the usual answer. It is the only asylum remaining to them: they boldly repudiate the authority of that Council. But as it had all the marks which they require in a lawful Council, what force this repudiation ought to have let pious readers judge!

Even were these things not so, I deny that there is truly one bishop under the whole Papacy, unless indeed, in a proof of such consequence, we are satisfied with the title and the insignia. I do not now say what kind of insignia they are by which they attract reverence. All the pious know that they are profane masks, at the sight of which the Apostles, if they were alive, would stand amazed. Assume, however, that if there was the reality besides, they would be in other respects befitting, are we to judge them bishops from mere empty parade? They have nothing episcopal about them except that a few occasionally mount the pulpit to deliver one or two sermons, and then, as if they had performed their part, do something else the rest of the year. Others are kept back by ignorance, and a goodly number from thinking it somehow or other beneath their dignity to address the people, although scarcely one in a hundred could be found who could perform the office of teaching without making himself a laughingstock.

Assume, however, that by their silence and doing nothing they are Successors of the Apostles, how few of them deign to make presbyters by their own hand? Do they not, for the most part, delegate the task to vile mendicants? Good God! to what are we fallen? that there should be such mockery in the Church, that any one bound by a vow of per-

petual poverty, but who, by begging and chanting, has raked together three hundred gold pieces, and spent them in purchasing a bull giving him the name of Ascalonite Bishop, may suddenly come forth a Successor of the Apostles, and hire out his labour everywhere in making presbyters, that the succession of the Church may not fail! Were the Apostles to behold this foul confusion of the sacred order, would they recognise in it anything of their own?

What if I refer them to Canonical Elections? I speak not now of the rule of Christ which alone ought to suffice us. I only ask, whether he is to be regarded as the just successor of a true bishop, who has either been obtruded by force or introduced by Simony, or raised to the episcopate by some profane method? Taking this position, let them answer me concerning the election of their Pope, whether it has any affinity, I say not with the ancient and too rigid form, but with the prescription of Nicolas as related by Gratian? Nicolas, who had already degenerated very widely from the pure form, delivers a mode of election which might be tolerated. If we are to take the matter strictly, the succession was at that time also interrupted. But what is done in the present day? I need not repeat what all know, that the Cardinals, in electing the Pope, pay no more respect to the injunctions of the decree of Nicolas, than the devils rioting in hell do to God speaking from heaven, (Distin. 23. cap. In Nomine.)

What is to be thought of the whole Bishops? The words of Leo, Bishop of Rome, are, "Let him who is to be over all be elected by all. For he who is assumed, without being examined and approved, is violently intruded." (Dist. 79, cap. Si quis Apostolicae Epist. 90.) And whenever he makes mention of this subject, he declares that none is a true bishop save he who has been elected by the clergy and sought by the people. (Epist. 87 et alibi.) Nor does Gregory in several passages speak differently. If their sentiments are to have effect, all who are called bishops in the Papacy in the present day must confess themselves to be robbers. For no one, however impudent, will say that he was sought by the people, while, as regards the Clergy, the ancient prac-

tice had long ago become so corrupt, that lazy bellies only, who call themselves Canons, sold their suffrages. Bishoprics have now begun to be the benefices of princes.

In addition to this is the manifest abomination of Simony. For what for the most part is now the recommendation which procures the honour? So far am I from taking pleasure in a lengthened detail, that it is painful even to advert to the flagitious insults offered to the Christian name. It is well, however, that while I am silent the fact speaks for itself, that nothing is more at variance with the order of the Apostles than the skulking licentiousness with which bishoprics are laid hold of in the present day. When the Apostle discourses how the Son of God was made a High Priest after the order of Melchisedec, he carefully follows out the similitude, without which the comparison made by David would not stand good. Unless they would exalt themselves by some new and special privilege above the Son of God, let them shew how modern bishoprics are framed on the apostolical model. No doubt there will be an admirable correspondence between the two, when one, who never in his life sees the people committed to him, when a boy ten years old, a pimp, a gambler, a sportsman, persons practised in all wickedness, and devoid both of piety and liberal learning, become the representatives of the Apostles!

A still greater dispute arises. If it appears that they are the most inveterate enemies of the doctrine which the Apostles not only delivered, but sealed with their blood; if it be made plain that all their counsels, all their endeavours, their whole purpose, are directed avowedly to subvert what the Apostles with the greatest labours established, what more would we? Let audience only be granted us, and we will easily shew that there is scarcely any part of sound doctrine which they have not vitiated by their corruptions. This much we shall certainly prove, that they have contaminated the pure worship of God by impious superstitions, and involved the doctrine both of faith and repentance in endless errors; that by darkness of various sorts they have not only obscured but almost extinguished the virtue and grace of Christ; and by unworthy methods have adulterated the

Sacraments. This the servants of Christ have been proving now for thirty years. We are proceeding in the same course, not to mention that of this our writings are clear witnesses.

These worthy men, when they see themselves overwhelmingly convicted and mortally wounded, tell us that no molestation must be given to the Successors of the Apostles! But a knowledge of the fact is to be ascertained by a discussion of doctrine, and to this we, trusting confidently in a good cause, voluntarily challenge them. To save themselves from answering, they wish to prejudge the very point in debate. Can it indeed be, that those who are in everything contrary to the Apostles, are able to prove merely by continuity of time that they hold the place and act as the Vicegerents of the Apostles? On the same pretext, one who, after murdering a man seizes on his house, might hold himself out as his representative!

The Papacy is much further distant from that mode of government which the Apostles recommend to us, than tyranny, however fierce and truculent, is from a free and well ordered state of liberty. Who would now bear a tyrant boasting the name of consular, or other lawful magistracy which he may have assumed? Not one whit less is the effrontery of those who, after overthrowing the sacred regimen, established both by the order of Christ and the practice of the Apostles, yet claim succession to it for their tyranny. For though the series of time were perfectly continuous, still if the Apostleship has fallen, (and this must be when the worship of God is torn asunder, the office of Christ buried, the light of doctrine extinguished, and the Sacraments polluted,) what Succession can remain? Unless perhaps it be, that as the heir succeeds to the dead, so these men think they have obtained the succession by the demise of godliness. But seeing they have completely changed the whole method of government, the chasm between them and the Apostles is too deep to allow of any intercommunication of right. To conclude this part of the subject in one word, I deny Succession to a thing which has no original. I likewise deny that the office of sacrificing, which they account the chief in their priesthood, ever flowed from the Apostles.

Let them, therefore, look out for the founders of their order.

When under the same pretext they shut the mouths of all the pious who long for a revival of the Church, by telling them they are not duly called to the office of teaching, they gain nothing more than to let the whole world see that their tyranny cannot stand unless the truth is oppressed. It is true, indeed, that in a well ordered Church none are to be admitted to the office of teaching but those who have been called by the ordinary pastors. But what is this to the Papacy unless the power of Christ be transferred to Antichrist? The Apostles gave endeavour, as was meet, to propagate the Church to posterity. For this purpose they ordained pastors elected by the suffrages of the people. Afterwards, along with purity of doctrine, the just method of electing became obsolete. Will none now be a proper minister of Christ save he who has crept in by corruption?

The Succession which they so haughtily arrogate to themselves I have already rescued from them. Let us remember, besides, that since, by their inauguration, they make Priests, not Pastors, all who submit to ordination by their hand are tied down to sacrilege. Shall none, then, be able to come forward, except under wicked and detestable auspices, to advance the kingdom of Christ? Nay, they say how much soever all things may have gone to wreck, let no man who is not called interfere. I have already observed that wherever the state of the Church is safe, or at least tolerable, an ordinary call is requisite. But is a law, therefore, laid upon God, and may not he extraordinarily, by his Spirit, raise up prophets and other ministers to restore his fallen and ruined Church?

But they say the perpetuity of the Church will never suffer this to happen. I indeed admit that the Church can never perish. But when that which is promised concerning the perpetual character of the Church is by them referred to Pastors, they err exceedingly. Though pastors were wanting the Church would not forthwith cease to be. Then, indeed, I admit, it truly stands and flourishes when the sheep are collected into one sheepfold, which can only be by the exer-

tion of shepherds. But experience teaches that the sheep, though scattered, are sometimes preserved by the secret power of God.

The Church, I say, sometimes lies hid, and escapes the eyes of men, so that any external regimen or Primacy is looked for in vain. Hence, though the Succession of the Bishops is interrupted, the perpetuity of the Church, nevertheless, stands. If they do not yet perceive that they are making ado about nothing, I ask where they read that it is necessary to the end of the world that bishop succeed bishop in uninterrupted series? We read, that in ancient times, when, partly by the ignorance and sluggishness, partly by the perfidy and wickedness of the priests, the worship of God had been vitiated, the administration of sacred rites lay unattended to, pure doctrine was perverted, and the Church had well-nigh fallen, prophets were raised up by the extraordinary inspiration of God to restore her ruined affairs. And, indeed, it was necessary that it should be so. What is said in Ezekiel and Jeremiah belongs to us not less than to the ancient people, that God, to punish the iniquity of evil shepherds, will drive them away, and give good and faithful shepherds to feed according to his will. (Ezek. xxxiv. 2; Jer. iii. 15; xxxiii. 12.) For although God daily gives such by the calling of men, yet there is a singular species of giving, when the work of man ceases, and he himself appoints those whom he sees to be necessary, though human judgment pass them by.

If they still quiver a dart against us, any one may retort, and ask, by what shield they defend themselves? Almost all their pulpits are occupied by monks, or other hired sophisters, who have learned to declaim by brawling in Sorbonne. Of all these, what is the call? Assuredly they cannot produce any other, except that when the bishops, with the whole herd of their priests, were dumb, they substituted strangers in their stead. But as that substitution is new, having taken place more than eight hundred years after the age of the Apostles, let them cease to make such impudent abuse of their name.

That those who at this time have held forth a torch to us,

to enable us, after long wandering, to return to the way, were holy prophets of God, is attested by the noble and truly divine specimen which they gave of their ministry. They never would have been called to do this service to the Church by the wolves who were burning with rage to destroy and devour it. Therefore, to cure an incurable evil, especially when the usual remedies failed, God himself behoved to bring assistance by putting forth his own hand. Now, the same wolves that beset the sheepfold complain that we have entered without their authority, and clamour against us as the disturbers of order, because, instead of waiting for a command from them, each, as was meet, has studied to do his utmost in succouring the poor sheep. But ever since matters were brought to a somewhat better state by our labours, the laying on of hands is observed with greater sanctity amongst us than in any part of the Papacy.

I come now to the other Orders, in reviewing which our moderators follow the vulgar custom, and apply the name of Sacrament to each. Here I shall be more brief than the importance of the subject deserves. For it is easy to shew in a few words how impudently they call upon us to acknowledge them to be Sacraments. I do not mention that throughout the Papacy Deacons and Inferiors are ordained not to do duty, but as persons who aspire to the honour of the Priesthood, to which their canons authorize them to climb step by step. And yet an expeditious method of leaping over has been invented: for in one day all the minor orders are heaped on one individual. In short, there is nothing in the farces acted by players so ludicrous as may be seen in that show of ordaining.

Our worthy moderators connive at the flagrant abuses, as if this were not a suitable time to correct them. But though I should say nothing about these, I hold it impossible to allow the name of a Sacrament to be applied to acts to which no promise of God applies. For what need is there for pretending a Sacrament in appointing a person to put dogs out of the church? And what in the present day is the office of Exorcists? For they do not even pretend any use of them as they do in the case of others. Yet they de-

clare that any one deserves ill of the Church who either abolishes or despises such kinds of orders. But how can they persuade us to receive with reverence a thing of which they do not exhibit an empty shadow even to deceive the eye? For in the Papacy Priests alone perform idle Exorcisms fit for nothing. They ordain Acolytes, that is, attendants. Is there such majesty in waiting on a bishop, that a spiritual mystery is to be coined out of it? Certainly nothing can shame them when they prostitute the name of Sacrament to such trifles.

And it is to be observed that this is the question between us. We do not fight about Acolytes and Ostiarii—whether or not it is expedient to have them. Let them, if they will, be useful rudimentary offices to train those of their youth who aspire to the government of the Church; although nothing of the kind is seen in the Papacy. If there was anciently any good in them, it has long since gone into desuetude. But granting all that they demand in regard to their utility, it was excessively audacious, not to say blasphemous, falsely to give them a name applicable only to the divinely instituted symbols of Divine grace. If grinning scoffers pretend to approve of this profanation for the sake of purchasing peace, all who have any serious fear of God will be withheld by conscience from giving their assent.

Marriage is their last Sacrament, and a Sacrament they say on account of the grace of Christ, which is never wanting to it. But this reason extends to every honest and approved method of living. Therefore, agriculture and the feeding of cattle, and all the arts which are called either liberal or mechanical, will be sacraments, as there is none of them on which God does not deign to bestow his blessing. We thus see how childishly they trifle. But another more plausible reason is added—because Marriage is compared with the sacred and spiritual union which Christ hath with the Church. As if Christ were not also compared to a shepherd, and a lamb, and a lion, and the sun, and a stone; and God to a man of war, and a tempest, and a scorching flame. Will all the similitudes that occur in Scripture be so many

sacraments? In this way theft will be classed among sacraments, as we read that the day of the Lord will be like a thief! A bare similitude, therefore, is far from making a sacrament.

It was not this, however, that misled the first authors of this fiction. But when, in the epistle where Paul treats of Marriage, they found the term Sacrament occurring in a clause, they rashly laid hold of it, and deemed it sufficient for founding a new dogma. In the meanwhile, it never occurred to them that Paul there, under the name of "Mystery," simply recommends the inestimable grace with which the Son of God visits us when he ingrafts us into his body. Therefore, to excite admiration of it, he exclaims that it is a great secret. For that is the meaning of Mystery, the term which he used. (Eph. v. 32.) The old interpreter, as he elsewhere does in the same Epistle, translated *Sacramentum*, but not at all thinking of what unlearned men afterwards dreamed. The error which thus originated in gross ignorance, is too impudently defended by our moderators. But the more we see crafty men insulting the word of God, in order to flatter Antichrists, the stronger the religious obligation which lies upon us not to enter into alliance with such impiety.

Hence, as error leads to error, they infer that the tie of Marriage is not dissolved because of adultery, and that those are not to be listened to who hold that faith which young men and women may have pledged to each other without the consent of their parents is not binding. In the first place, what they say is founded on a false and perverted interpretation of the words of Christ. For when he affirms that whoso marrieth her that hath been put away, committeth adultery, we must supply the exception which he had set down, viz., unless because of adultery. And, indeed, it would have been to no purpose to have spoken of adulterous women, whose divorce was followed by capital punishment among the Jews. If there were no great danger in their error when they thus pervert the words of Christ, they might perhaps be forgiven, but this involves the salvation of husbands who banish adulterous wives from their dwellings. Our impartial moderators bind them to perpetual celibacy.

What if they need a wife? No help for it; they must just fret on and atone for another's crime with the destruction of their soul. Thus a Christian man will be forced either to cherish adultery and swallow the dishonour of an unchaste wife, or be cruelly subjected to perpetual disquietude, if the gift of continence be not bestowed upon him. While they provide so ill for miserable consciences, shall we aid their inhuman tyranny by their assent?

Of the Espousals rashly contracted by young persons, I will only say this—A word is as good to deny as it is good for our moderators to assert. Who revealed to them that such espousals should be binding? That the authority of parents is requisite, nature herself dictates, and this has been always observed both by the law of nations and is approved by the testimony of Scripture. But the dignity of a Sacrament, they say, is to be preferred to the parents' right. Allowing them to abuse the name of Sacrament, it is more than absurd to represent it as honour to the Sacrament when anything is done wrongfully and inordinately. The more dignity there is in Marriage, the greater the modesty and religion with which it ought to be entered into. But if such indulgence is an honour to the Sacrament, why are they not as lenient in the Marriage of priests and nuns? The vow is an obstacle, just as the right of nature is an obstacle here, and yet they hesitate not to break through it.

When they acknowledge that the Sacrifice of Christ is the only one by which sins are expiated, and men reconciled to God, I wish they would persist in it. But a little after they shew that they had no other intention, by so prefacing, than to give a specious colouring to their Mass, by which they consider that that one sacrifice is applied. But whatever be the colours with which they adorn it, they will never make its meretricious glare to be anything but abomination to all the children of God.

But, that we may proceed in regular order, we must begin with the general chapter, in which they teach that Humiliation of heart and Chastisements of the flesh, endured for the sake of piety and the like, are Sacrifices applicatory of that one sacrifice. Whence that thoughtlessness, or forget-

fulness, or stupidity, which makes them pass over faith which has the principal part in this application? I do not speak strongly enough, for it is only by faith that we perceive the efficacy of Christ's death. Other things only accompany faith as a kind of appendages, and borrow of it whatever they possess. It is clear from Paul that faith is an excellent sacrifice. He likewise teaches, that by it the reconciliation with God, which Christ procured for us by his death, is applied. When our mediators are professing to treat the matter accurately, how comes it that they are altogether silent as to faith? It alone properly sanctifies all the exercises of piety.

Again, from whom did they learn, that by Chastisements of the flesh, which Paul declares to be of small profit, (1 Tim. iv. 8,) the grace obtained by the death of the Son of God is applied to us? I admit that they are helps which lead us on to seek forgiveness of sins in Christ, but it is foolish to infer from this that the Sacrifice of Christ is applied to us by them, as if we were to obtain salvation by fasting, or any other outward chastisement of the flesh. I hear David saying, that a broken and a contrite heart is a pleasing sacrifice to God, (Psalm li. 19;) but that by it the sacrifice which Christ offered to reconcile us to God is applied, neither he nor any of the Prophets or Apostles teaches;—so far are we from meriting this honour by external works, which occupy much lower ground.

I acknowledge, however, that afterwards, in another passage, our mediators, as if they had been awoke at last, remember Faith. But what kind of faith do they fabricate? That which sees a Sacrifice in the Mass. Accordingly, they justly couple it with devotion; whereas the man deserves execration who, turning aside from the death of Christ, goes up and down seeking for salvation in this quarter and in that. But the sacrifice of the mass depends on the death of Christ. Let us now consider this.

Christ, they say, when he offered his body to be eaten by the faithful, gave a commandment to his Apostles, whom he appointed priests of the law, to offer it. O the foolish ἀλαζωνεία (boasting) of those whom I know to be the com-

pilers of this absurd farrago! Where is Oblation commanded? They answer, where it is said, "This do." When, twenty years ago, Clithoveus, and other animals of the same stamp, extracted a Sacrifice out of this expression, and for that purpose quoted the line of Virgil—"When I shall do with a calf instead of corn"—there was no man of any judgment who did not laugh at the silliness of the argument; yet their folly was pardoned, as they were babbling about things they knew not. But those men must be wrong in the head who, in such light, hesitate not to give vent to absurdities which they themselves laugh at in their hearts, and which they are aware will be ridiculed by others.

Still, as if the matter were worthy of consideration, let us attend to it. *Do*, they say, is a Priest's word. Admitted. But in what idiom do they think Christ spoke? And yet this is not the hingeing point: for the word *doing* is sometimes used in Hebrew with reference to Sacrifice. At present we are only discussing in what sense Christ said, "This do in remembrance of me." To solve the difficulty, our best interpreter is Paul, who conjoins the two things together, "This do as oft as ye drink it." What else could the disciples do than just what their Master had previously shewn by his own example? Nay, who does not see that this has no reference to the former words, which ordered them to receive and communicate among themselves? But after hearing Paul's interpretation, it is needless to debate a matter free from doubt. But if they yet hold out because the thing was said to the Apostles, whom they imagine to be Priests, let them tell us who they were that Paul addressed when he repeated the same words. Does he not, after premising that he delivered to the whole Church of Corinth, men and women indiscriminately, what he had received of the Lord, command them to do the same thing? Would they allow themselves thus insultingly to wrest the words of Christ, were they not inflated with Epicurean arrogance, and disposed to hold everything sacred in contempt?

Of a similar nature is the allegation, that before Christ held forth his body to his disciples under the appearance of Bread, he offered it to his Father. How do they divine that

he did so? It was surely a thing worthy of being mentioned. But the texture of the narrative of the evangelists simply is, that he took bread, brake it, and gave it. With what face then do they thus affirm a thing which is nowhere found, and has no semblance? Were they to bring forward all kinds of conjectures, the magnitude of the point involved would not allow anything to be founded on them. But when their foolish allegation is utterly devoid of probability, who does not scout it at once?

They affirm that without this there is no ground for saying that Christ was made a Priest after the order of Melchisedec. I am aware that they are not the first who have stumbled at that stone. But if we will set men aside and look at the thing itself, it will at once be seen to be vainer than vanity.

Moses relates that Melchisedec offered bread and wine to Abraham. Those who expiscate a sacred and mystical Oblation out of this, understand that he offered to God. But Moses immediately after mentioning that Melchisedec came out to meet Abraham, adds, that he offered, or brought bread and wine. When they imagine that the clause which immediately follows assigns the reason, they only double the error. Moses indeed adds, "And he was priest of the most high God." But this refers to the right of blessing, to acquaint us that Melchisedec blessed Abraham in his office and character as a priest. Thus far no sacrifice of bread is seen in Melchisedec. To this is added the stronger argument, that the Apostle, while he discusses almost scrupulously every single point to which the similitude may apply, makes no allusion to anything of this kind. He carefully mentions the country and the name, the kingdom and the priesthood, and then, that though, sprung from himself, he had no genealogy, that is, none handed down by writing, yet he offered tithes to Abraham, as an inferior to his superior—in short, that he blessed Abraham by his right as priest. Had there been any mystery in the bread, nothing more appropriate to the subject then treated could have been introduced. Assuredly, the Holy Spirit did not omit it through forgetfulness. How comes it then that He is

silent? Just because he did not choose to introduce it unseasonably. Indeed, it is strange for them to seek a figure in the bread, while so often repeating that the bread which is offered is changed into body. How, according to them, will the reality correspond to the figure, if there is no bread in the holy Supper? Let this however suffice for the present, that the bread offered by Melchisedec gives them no support, because the thing which they imagine was not at all observed by the Holy Spirit.

They also seize upon the well known passage of Malachi, "In every place will a pure oblation be offered to my name among the Gentiles," (Mal. i. 11,) as if this were nought else than the sacrifice of the Mass. But though we go over all the passages of the New Testament which treat of sacrifice, no Mass will be found in them. Is there not a pure offering when we are consecrated to God by the gospel—when any of us offers himself to him by the mortification of the flesh—when we sacrifice "the calves of our lips," as another prophet says? (Hos. xiv. 2.) Why, then, disregarding all the sacrifices which Scripture recommends to us, do they turn to the Mass alone, of which there is not a single word, but just because they are in all things absurd?

But as it is here clear as day to all men of sense, that after the manner of the Prophets, the worship of God is here designated under the name of Sacrifice, of what use is it to argue to and fro about nothing? As it is very common with the Prophets to designate the knowledge of God by dreams and visions, so they take the temple, the altar, the incense, and sacrifices for the worship of God. Hence has arisen that mode of speaking by which they accommodated their teaching to their age, wherein we know that the worship of God was involved in such ceremonies. In short, as such modes of expression savour of the tutelage of the law, we should extract out of them the spiritual truth which alone applies to us. It is now more than clear that it is a mere quibble to quote Malachi as prophesying of the Mass, there being nothing less in his thoughts.

I pay no regard to the ancient opinions which our moderators here collect in order to overwhelm the truth. The

regular practice of these fellows is to rake together everything defective which occurs in the Fathers, just as one neglecting the gold would gather merely the dross, or throwing away the wheat, carefully gather the tares. When they boast, therefore, that the passage of Malachi is thus expounded by Irenaeus, that the oblation of Melchisedec is thus handled by Athanasius, Ambrose, Augustine, and Arnobius, the brief answer is, that these same writers elsewhere interpret bread also to mean the body of Christ, but so ridiculously, that reason and truth compel us to dissent. Jeremiah introduces the wicked who had conspired against him as speaking thus, "Let us send wood into his bread." (Jer. xi. 19.) It is obvious that this was just equivalent to saying, "Let us choke him with his bread," or the like. Ancient writers transfer this to Christ, and, as I have said, interpret the bread allegorically for his body, which was fastened to the wood. Let our worthy moderators then cease to employ the sentiments of the ancients as their weapons of war in a bad cause.

I have already shewn in what sense Melchisedec is said to have offered bread. The thing is clear in itself, and the silence of the Apostle ought to be a sufficient proof, as he never would have omitted what would have been so appositely said, could it have been said truly. We cannot think that either Ambrose or any other in the whole body of the Fathers saw more acutely than the Apostle himself, unless we are to attribute perspicacity to them to such a degree, that they discerned a mystery which escaped the Holy Spirit, speaking through the mouth of an Apostle.

As ingenuousness is to be cultivated in all cases, so it is most unlawful, when religion is the subject, to act craftily or even dissemblingly. Our opponents seeing us armed with the word of God, lay hold here and there of all the passages they can, and corrupt many of them by their quibbles, throwing in the smoke of antiquity to obscure the light of divine truth. Meanwhile, they have no wish that it should be inquired how widely they themselves differ from antiquity. The thing, however, is manifest. We have a clear specimen of it in the Mass. To omit the vulgar Sor-

bonnists, our mediators, in defending the Sacrifice of the Mass, bring forward both the ancient mode of expression and the rite of sacrifice. I concede both to them. The ancients misapplied not only the term sacrifice, but the ceremony. But if we consider how far the slight corruption of the ancients is from the impiety with which these men bedaub it, we shall find the distance to be immense. Whatever it was that the ancients did, they interpreted it to be the commemoration of a sacrifice. These antiquity men, (as they would be thought,) not contented with commemoration, inculcate application, as we shall by and bye see.

But though the ancient Fathers were clear of the impious superstition which afterwards prevailed, they are not altogether excusable; inasmuch as it appears that they deviated from the pure and genuine institution of Christ. For while the end for which the Supper is to be celebrated is to communicate in the Sacrifice of Christ, they, not contented with this, added oblation also. This addition I hold to have been vitious, partly because it obscures the benefit rendered to us by the death of Christ, and partly because it is foreign to the nature of the holy Supper.

The office of Christ was to offer himself to God. The only part now remaining to us is to eat. He who, not satisfied with mere receiving, longs for the image of a sacrifice, attributes less than he ought, both to the death which Christ died, and to the ordinance of the Supper which he left in commemoration of his death. For though Papists, or others not much unlike Papists, should cry out a thousand times that in old time the bread was offered—that the early Christians were accustomed to do so—that the practice is not new, we can a thousand times reply, that the command of Christ is an inviolable rule which no practice of men, no prescription of time, can either abolish or remodel by new decrees.

I have given what seemed the proper answer in regard to the authority of the Fathers. Wherefore, when our mediators conclude that the Church, in accordance with the testimony of Scripture and holy Fathers, recognises two Sacrifices, they falsify as to the one, and err as to the other, by attributing more than they ought to the opinions or decisions of men.

For they falsely pretend Scripture, which is repugnant to them throughout, and they so shamefully lacerate it, that they cannot even impose on children who have once been put on their guard. I have already given more than a complete exposure of their iniquity. In regard to ancient writers, there is no ground for allowing deference for them to withdraw us from the eternal and inflexible truth of God. Let those, then, whom the wisdom of God does not satisfy, keep to themselves that unbloody sacrifice of man's devising.

The doctrine of Scripture is simple, and by no means ambiguous, that in the Sacrifice by which it behoved men to be reconciled to God, Christ died once—that the efficacy of his Sacrifice is eternal—and that the benefit of it is received by us every day. In order to our enjoying it the Son of God instituted the holy Supper, in which he holds forth his body, once sacrificed for us, as food that we may eat. In this way the virtue of that one Sacrifice is applied to us, and we become partakers of it.

Turn over the whole of Scripture, and you will find nothing else than that our Passover has been sacrificed, that our only Priest entered once into the Holy of Holies, in order that by one offering he might expiate the sins of the world. To us nothing else is commanded than to feast. What audacity then is it for mortal man to come forward to discharge a priesthood which was never committed to him, to offer an unbloody sacrifice which God nowhere requires! Let our mediators then place that Sacrifice somewhere else than in the Church. They shall never get an acknowledgment of it from us, until they persuade us that some one else is the fit founder of a Sacrifice than the Son of God, who was appointed a High Priest for ever, with no successor, no colleague. Let whatever addition has crept into the holy Supper, without his authority, from the excessive cupidity or lukewarmness of men, be corrected according to the rule of his authority. To do so Paul admonishes us, as his words imply, when he says, "I have received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you." (1 Cor. xi. 23.) The Oblation, however, which flowed from an unknown source, our mediators wickedly and profanely ascribe to Christ.

I see what those will say who are ready to confound Christ with Belial, provided they can purchase any kind of peace. For I know the minds of those men, and have long been accustomed to their maxims. They will charge us with excessive rigidity for stirring up an unnecessary contention about a single word, and an external rite. It is not strange that they should thus accuse us, for they speak as they feel. But seeing that a better feeling has been given us, we behove to confess what with the heart we have believed. For the law which the Spirit of God gives to all the pious is, "I believed, therefore will I speak." (Psalm cxvi. 10.)

When some worthy man lately told me that a certain horned goat, out of the fetid herd of Popish bishops, who for a long time has been suspended between heaven and hell, is wont to say that he sees no reason why we should refuse to embrace this painted formula of moderation; I answered, as historians relate of Alexander,—"Nor would I, if I were in his place, refuse, and he, if he were in my place, would do the very thing which he now wonders at my doing." For why should we wonder that men of this stamp, who have been employed for so many years in denying Christ, should scorn our simplicity, seeing they hesitate not to scoff at God himself? The decrees of our heavenly Master ought to be of such weight with us, that we doubt not to fight to the last in their defence. Let us not think that anything on which he has been pleased to give his command is subject to our will.

Here, however, our contest with the moderators is about a substance, not merely a word and a rite. For they say that in the Mass is comprehended the reality of those things which all the ancient sacrifices prefigured—that there is in it the same victim of body and blood as was sacrificed upon the cross! Whence it appears, that for that one Sacrifice of Christ this secondary one is substituted, in order that the efficacy of the former may reach us. My brief answer is, that all the sacrifices which ever were in use must be tested by this Lydian stone. Have they their origin from God, or have they it from men? Besides requiring to have respect to Christ, they behove also to have God for their author.

Wherefore, although in appearance the latter may seem to differ little or nothing from the sacrifices which we read of having been offered by pious individuals among the Gentiles, still we hesitate not to condemn them as spurious, while we pronounce the former to be legitimate and holy. In what does the distinction consist, but just in that twofold mark of the end and the command? Therefore our mediators, in order to prove that there is a particle of reality in the sacrifice of the Mass, must first of all produce the command of God, which we know they cannot do: and therefore we are bold to conclude that it is nothing but an empty figment.

The wish they express for a clear and succinct interpretation to be annexed to the Canon, is, I admit, not without cause. But what glosses will they find to hide their gross absurdities? It is certain that things repugnant to each other are contained in it, and that its clauses have been ill sewed together by unskilful hands. They say that they offer to God, for his gifts and givings, a pure victim, the holy bread of eternal life. The words imply that the body of Christ consists of bread. Let them soften down the harshness of the terms as they may, people of discernment perceive that the prayer which the ancient Church used to offer up concerning common oblations, the compilers of the Canon of the Mass have ignorantly transferred to the body of Christ.

The Alms which the faithful contributed were laid upon the altar as sacred to God. The Priest prayed in the name of the people, that God would be pleased to accept them. The barbarians who came afterwards, either ignorant of the ancient practice, or not knowing any but their own imaginary sacrifice, added at random, body and blood. This ignorance is made more manifest by their shortly after adding, "by whom thou always createst, sanctifiest, and blessest all these good things." These words, let them be twisted as they may, can never be adapted to a Sacrament. What, then, are the good things which God daily creates for us, but just those which each of the pious, according to his means, contributes for the use of the poor. For that this was anciently the form of consecrating Oblations is apparent

from the decree of the Arausican Council:—"We offer unto thee, O Lord, the things which we have received from thy hand." By what glosses, pray, will they extricate themselves, so as not to be here held convicted of the most shameful hallucination? These are small matters, and my only object in adverting to them is, to let all understand that no absurdities are too vile not to be pertinaciously defended by those stage players, who act the part of mediators.

Let us now proceed to more serious matters. The Missal priest says that he offers the body and blood of the Son of God in sacrifice. The act is wholly divine, and no man, unless called by heaven, ought to intermeddle with it. For when the Apostle discourses of a lawful priesthood, he concedes the honour to none but him on whom God has conferred it, so that he says it behoved even Christ himself to be ordained to it by the call of the Father. (Heb. v. 4.) If he who discharges the office of priest, without being called by God, usurps honour to himself wickedly, and contrary to law and right, let the Missal priestlings now shew by what divine command they presume to offer Christ.

The whole discussion of the Apostle, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, from the beginning of the seventh to the end of the tenth chapter, turns on these two cardinal points,—*first*, that Christ alone was fit to offer himself; and, *secondly*, that he made one Oblation, which continues perpetually in force. They think they can get over the difficulty by a most admirable subtlety. It is, that while they now offer the same Sacrifice which Christ once offered, they do not introduce a new or different one. But as Scripture both claims for Christ the office of offering, and testifies that he offered once, they gain nothing by that cavil of identity, if I may so express it; for they in the mean time seize to themselves what belongs to Christ alone, and what was performed once repeat a thousand times every day.

The Canon adds, that this is done for the redemption of souls. But the Apostle reclaims when he says that Christ ascended into the heavens, having obtained eternal redemption. If the Sacrifice offered on the Cross obtained eternal redemption, they are certainly false when they profess still in

the present day to sacrifice in order to redeem! Our mediators would here satisfy us, that is, dazzle our eyes with a convenient interpretation. They will admit that we are redeemed by the one Sacrifice of Christ, but they hold that in this manner the benefit of it is applied to us. But I have already wiped away this gloss; nay, it is cut to the quick by a single expression of the Apostle, when he says that the sacrifices of the law were unable to take away sin, because they were frequently repeated, (Heb. x. 1.,) and he distinguishes us from the Fathers by this mark, that among them there was a yearly remembrance of sin. Certainly we too ought continually to confess our sins, nor can we pray for forgiveness in any other way than by remembering the sacrifice. Wherefore, the passage can only be understood by making the difference to consist in this, that a visible sacrifice was then used to testify the expiation of sins, but is not so now, since the substance of the figures has been exhibited.

In short, those who pretend that Christ is now offered for the salvation of souls, deny that God has been reconciled to men. Can we subscribe to the blasphemy which transfers the proper office of Christ to a human action? Christ will indeed deservedly cut us off as perfidious covenant breakers from sharing in the great benefit, if for his one eternal sacrifice we tacitly allow the substitution of things which he never either appointed or approved.

With what consistency is God afterwards asked, in the Canon, to accept of the sacrifice of Christ's flesh and blood, as he did of the sacrifices of Abel and Abraham, and to command it to be borne to his high altar by the hands of angels? Behold their piety which scarcely deigns to bestow the same honour on the Son of God as on beasts! For what do they pray? That Christ may please the Father, like that ram which Abraham sacrificed! In this respect at least the Canon is very uncanonical: it makes the shadow the rule of the substance, and tests the grace which the Sacrifice of Christ possesses by that which was possessed by the sacrifices of beasts. But let them pretend what they please. With what conscience shall we consent to so foul an affront to Christ as almost to let brute beasts take precedence of him?

The addition which they make is not to be neglected. If no change is made in the Canon, necessity is laid upon us to pray for our Pope Paul III.! Must we then, when we appear in the presence of God, when the heart ought in a manner to pour itself wholly out, call him "our father," who is the most cruel butcher of the children of God?—acknowledge him as a shepherd, who is the chief of wolves and robbers, in slaying and devouring the sheep of Christ?—assign the first place in the Church to him who is not only an alien to it, but its most inveterate foe? Let Islebius, and similar apostates, have such fathers to themselves, that thus they may make God the witness of their impious defection, as they fear not basely and flagitiously to profess it before men.

At last, our mediators provide that no change is to be made in the ceremonies of the Mass, because they are all exceedingly appropriate to what is done in it. If the subject talked of were a boy's show, this might perhaps be said with truth; but they have no more affinity with the holy Supper of Christ, than a swine or a dog has with God's altar. In every religious act, a certain celestial majesty ought to shine forth, but more especially in the celebration of the Supper, when the Lord invites us to a secret participation in his flesh and blood. Of the gravity of the Missal Rites, my reader shall have a taste from that part of them which I will here recite. Omitting what they call the Introit, and other endless trifles, I will advert to the gesticulations of the Canon alone:—

Let the priest, folding his hands, kneel before the altar, and thereafter kiss it on the right side: let him here make three crosses: let him raise his hands and stretch them out, and then folding his hands make mention of the living: let him bend his knees a little; extend his hands over the host; make five crosses; join his hands upwards; wipe his hands on the napkin; raise the host and then the chalice: putting them aside, let him extend his arms as if giving himself the form of a cross: let him draw back his arms and make three crosses over the whole sacrifice, a fourth over the body, a fifth over the chalice: let him place his hands upon the sacrifice and raise his eyes upwards: let him kneel at the altar with

clasped hands: let him kiss the altar: let him sign himself with the sign of the cross: joining his hands let him make a commemoration of the dead, striking his breast once or three times: let him make three crosses: let him uncover the chalice: let him make three crosses on the bread, then two between it and the chalice: let him exhibit the host with his right hand, and, uncovering the chalice, stretch out his hands: let him touch the bottom, middle, and top of the chalice with the paten: let him put it to his mouth and eyes: let him make three parts of the host, one longer than the others; of the least let him make three crosses, and then place it on the chalice: let him kiss the others.

It will be said that the things are of that middle sort of which the use is indifferent to Christians. Why then do they forbid any omission? But to pass this, how unbecoming is it that a player on the stage should have an hundred times more gravity than a priest has in ratifying the Covenant between God and man? Of a truth they assume too much license to themselves in external matters, if they account it as nothing that the heavenly mystery of the Supper is deformed by such indecorous gesticulations. I abstain from further exposing them, because it pains me to think of such foul mockery of the Christian name; but these felons, who have lost all sense of shame, scout the smallest correction of the greatest absurdities. From this it appears that they aim at nothing else than speedily again extinguishing whatever light has shone on our times. To crown their effrontery, they allege that the ritual of the modern Mass is clearly exhibited by Augustine. They quote the Epistle to Paulinus, which is the fifty-ninth in order. To make palpable the wicked license which they take in lying, I will allow my readers to judge by reading for themselves.

Next come two kinds of Commemoration of the Dead, which, as they were anciently practised, our mediators wish to be retained. The ancient custom was, during the celebration of the holy Supper, to name the Apostles and chief Martyrs, and those most commonly known, that by such examples the faith of all might be animated. In the next place, they read out the names of those who had recently

died and given proof of piety to the last, that they might thus have a solemn testimony to their perseverance. All these things, as they tended to the recommendation of Christian unity, and stimulated the living to imitate the faith of the dead, we by no means disapprove, so that there was no occasion for the load of testimonies which our mediators pile up more from ostentation than learning. Shortly after, corruption crept in from both quarters. It came to be the practice for the Church to ask to be aided by the prayers of the Martyrs, and in turn to interpone her prayers to obtain refreshment for the dead who had died in the faith of Christ. Thus a threefold commemoration, both of martyrs and others, was made.

I do not disguise that both superstitions have prevailed for many centuries. But in religion, whose only foundation is the eternal truth of Christ, length of years ought not to have much weight. Let us now attend to the former. Our mediators enjoin not only that the names of Martyrs be read out to do them honour, and thanks be given to God for their piety, but also in order that we may be assisted by their prayers. I hold that by such commemoration the holy Supper of Christ is polluted and profaned. For while all invocation ought to be pure and religious, more especially, when this ordinance is celebrated, ought reverence in invoking God to be augmented by his presence. Moreover, Paul affirms that we do not duly pray to God until we are instructed by his word. (Rom. x. 14.) Hence it follows, that no form of prayer not founded on the word of God is legitimate. Let them now shew where the Spirit teaches us to oppose the patronage of any Prophet, or Apostle, or Martyr to God. Let us always hold it as our principle, that we do not pray rightly unless the word of God leads the way. If, therefore, without his dictation, we introduce the intercession of Saints, our prayer is profane.

Let us hear our moderators on the other side. They say it is agreeable to reason that the Saints who live with God beyond the world should pray for us, being bound to do so by the command of James, "Pray one for another." (James v. 16.) But I always thought that this Epistle was written

to the living and not to the dead! They certainly cannot impose by this acumen on any man who is not exceedingly obtuse. James is exhorting those who need not only the teaching but also the prayers of their brethren, because of their labouring under the infirmity of the flesh. In this number are no longer the Apostles or Martyrs, who have finished their contest. For Paul declares that the course of believers is terminated by death. (2 Tim. iv. 7.)

But it is meet that they should condole with us in our distresses, and hence, also, it follows, that they intercede with God for us, because they want neither the will nor the means. I answer, that they act too curiously who guess at the state of the dead without any authority from Scripture, and they too presumptuously who affirm anything with regard to it. We must ask our moderators when it was revealed to them, that those whom death has removed from the society of the living are conscious of their wants? Paul says, in Luke, that David, after he had served his generation, died, and these words imply that he now ministers to posterity by his death. That those who are of the body of Christ wait for the completion of the kingdom of God, I deny not; but to attribute to them like affections with our own, as seeing everything which is done in the world, is presumptuous, unless it can be demonstrated by clear passages of Scripture.

But this our moderators insist they can do. For they produce Onias and Jeremiah, who when dead stretch forth their hands to God for the safety of the people. The Second Book of Maccabees relates, I admit, that Judas Maccabaeus dreamed so; but how, pray, shall we determine what credit is due to the dream of Judas? The writer of that history begs pardon for any error he may have committed, from human frailty, by writing inappropriately. Grant him then the pardon which he asks; only let him not force any one to err along with him, and let us be at liberty to distinguish all human writings whatever from the sure oracles of God. I should like to know why our moderators do not recommend the patronage of Onias and Jeremiah, whom they allege to be known to them from Scripture, rather than that

of Peter or Paul, of whom nothing of the kind has been handed down. But in preference to prophets they desire and speak of only more recent patrons.

With regard to Angels a different view must be taken, in accordance with the different nature of their office. The care and protection of the pious has been committed to them. They must therefore, in obedience to God, be solicitous about our salvation; and they only discharge the duty assigned them by praying for us. But while Scripture specially assigns this office to angels, it withdraws the souls of the pious, who rest in the Lord, from sharing it with them. Assuredly, if God employed their services in caring for our salvation, Scripture would speak as openly of them as of the angels. God declares that all the angels watch over the protection of the righteous. (Heb. i. 14, &c.) Why so, but just that we may be furnished with greater confidence? As much would have been said of blessed spirits, were the analogy well founded. Now, that nothing is said of them, we must hold it to be otherwise, the more especially that the subject is one on which knowledge would be most useful.

But granting that the Apostles and Martyrs pray for us, it is not a legitimate inference that we are therefore to implore their assistance. The servant of Abraham (Gen. xxiv. 7) is told that an angel will be with him; but when there is need of the angel's presence, it is not at all to the angel that he has recourse. The servant of Elisha (2 Kings vi. 17) sees an immense host of angels armed to give assistance to himself and his master, and yet, invoking God, he leans not on their support. Let pious readers again call to mind what I formerly observed, that the law enjoined on all with regard to prayer is to do nothing without the word of God. But those wander beyond the word of God who call upon other Intercessors in heaven besides Christ, and, therefore, I say that they overleap the proper bounds of prayer.

It is easy to remove the gloss which our mediators put on certain passages. Jacob, they say, wished that his name should be invoked by his posterity. (Gen. xlviii. 16.) In accordance with this Moses prays in these words, "Remember, Lord, thy servants Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." (Exod.

xxxii. 13.) So also in the Psalms believers beseech God to remember David. (Psalm cxxxii. 1.) I answer, it is easy to see what is meant by invocation in the blessing of Manasseh and Ephraim. Jacob only wished that the benefit of the divine covenant might come by hereditary right to his grandsons. Salvation had been promised to his seed. God had deposited his promise in the hands of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob himself. He therefore asks that they may be classed among the tribes of the holy people. Nor has Moses any respect to the persons of men when he brings forward the names of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but to confirm himself and others in the faith of the promise, he mentions the reason why it should be performed to them: as if he had said, "O Lord, we approach thee in no other confidence than that of thy promise; for we are the people of whom thou didst promise to our fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that thou wouldst be their God." Our mediators, then, must not hope to dazzle our eyes by scattering about their vain shows.

I come to the Merits of the Saints, on which, also, they will have our prayers to depend. It is indeed something, that in regard to them their proud boasting is softened; but still it is impossible to allow their assertion, that by the kindness of God and the gift of Christ they are available to us both for protection and the obtaining of grace. Nowhere is this attributed to them by the word of God. The Lord, I acknowledge, visits man with his favour to the thousandth generation, as he has promised, but our mediators foolishly infer from this, that the merits of parents redound to their children. (Exod. xx. 6.) We should rather regard it as the crowning point of divine mercy, that it superabounds in all manner of ways; so that, after freely stretching out a saving hand to fathers, it extends it also to posterity. To transfer the least part of this praise from the goodness of God to the merits of men is impious and blasphemous malignity.

Our moderators derive no support to their error from what they say of David, viz., that God often pitied the people for his sake. For as a covenant had been made with David for the safety of the whole people, we must view him as invested

with this capacity, if we would properly understand why God, in preserving the people, had respect to him rather than to Josiah or Hezekiah. If these remarks are not relished by perfidious corrupters of Scripture, they are strong enough however to shake and throw down all the engines of hell. But let us at the same time hold forth the fundamental principle which I formerly laid down, viz., that the only method of praying rightly and piously is that which exactly corresponds to the rule of the divine will. And the whole Scripture enjoins us to bring no other mediator before God than Jesus Christ alone, and teaches us that there is no other on whose patronage and merits we can depend in order to come boldly before the throne of God. In this way we shall find that whosoever goes about seeking for other patrons or intercessors, is not contented with the patronage of Christ. We must, therefore, anxiously take care that we do not by catching at several means of approach, shut the only door by which we can have access to God. If possible let us rather die an hundred times, than by our consent allow such profanation to break in upon the holy Supper of Christ.

No more are we to concede their wish to Worship the Dead on Feast-days, in order that they may give us part in their merits, and aid us by their intercession with God. Behold the Christian Reformation of which they give hope to those who know no better! Did they say that feast days are a kind of invitations to cultivate the memory of virtues, and thereby provoke to imitation, there would indeed be some colour for it, but to found worship on the observance of days as they do, is too bad. I am aware they will say that this is their intention, but let the fact be judge.

They enjoin the feast day of the Patron Saint to be kept in every parish; and not contented with this, they invoke every individual patron on whom this honour is bestowed. While it is sufficiently clear that they are held patrons just as if they were tutelary gods—ought not the prophetic voice to sound in our ears, "According to the number of thy cities are thy gods?" (Jer. ii. 28.) How foul then will be our ingratitude, if leaving the fountain of life we hew out for ourselves such cisterns? Did they raise Prophets and

Apostles alone to this honour, it would become us strongly to interpose and prevent the holy servants of God from being converted into idols. But now the height of absurdity is added to impiety: for any kind of patrons have feast days assigned to them! Many Churches, moreover, are dedicated to Catherine or Christopher, or other fictitious names. The people there are to ask the Lord that they may be assisted by the prayers of Catherine or Christopher! Is there to be such mockery of God that the prayers of patrons who never existed are to be obtruded on him? Can those who supply food to such monsters have ever had one particle of faith, or of serious and sincere invocation? I say nothing of Dominic and similar manslayers; nothing of Medardus, Lubin, and similar wild beasts. For what end would there be if I were to examine all the wanderings of the labyrinth into which our mediators entice us? But wo, twice and three times wo to the perfidy of those who so easily plunge into voluntary destruction, which they ought to have warded off by a hundred deaths, if they had a hundred lives!

There remains another order of the Dead of whom they wish mention to be made in the Supper, viz., that a place of refreshment, light, and peace may be given them. I deny not that this is a very ancient custom, and since the power, or rather dominion of custom is great, I admit that such prayers were approved by Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Augustine, and others, because passed to them by their ancestors, as it were from hand to hand. I do not think, however, that it had crept into use long before the age of those whose names I have mentioned. After it had prevailed for a short time, they followed it too easily, without reason or judgment.

As our moderators have been pleased to quote Augustine as a witness, let them hear from another passage how strongly he inclines to a contrary sentiment. He says, (Homil. in Joann. 59,) "The holy patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, good believers, have been received in peace. All however are still to receive in the end what God has promised: for there is promised the resurrection of the body, the swallowing up of death, eternal life with angels. This, in short, all receive along with them: for the rest

which is given after death, each, if he is worthy of it, receives at the time when he dies." If there is one rest to all, it will be no less superfluous to pray for any one out of the whole body of believers, than to pray for Isaiah or Paul. But the latter Augustine everywhere declares is not to be done: it follows, therefore, that we should leave them to enjoy their rest, beyond which nothing better can now be wished for them, and not abuse the name of God by prayers which are unlawful.

The mediators insist that it is an Apostolical Tradition, and prove it by the testimony of Dionysius. Moreover, in quoting his words, they insert the name of the Apostles so stealthily as to make it appear done by himself: but he there mentions divine guides whom he is ever and anon calling masters. Then, as if they had put out men's eyes, they adorn their Dionysius with the title of Areopagite. Eusebius sometimes mentions the Areopagite, who he says was first bishop of the Church of Athens; and he relates that it was so delivered by Dionysius of Alexandria. He does not say that anything was committed to writing by him, and yet, certainly, if it had been so, he would not have omitted it. But Jerome mentions two Dionysiuses among ecclesiastical writers, one of Corinth who flourished under Marcus Antoninus Verus and Lucius Commodus, and another, the disciple of Origen, and bishop of Alexandria, during the reign of Galienus: but among their writings which he carefully reviews, there is no mention of the Celestial or Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. Wherever these works are quoted, let us understand that they are by an unknown author, and not very ancient. This both the style and the subject clearly demonstrate.

But Chrysostom ascribes the Tradition to the Apostles, just as he does very many other things which, while they were commonly received, were of unknown origin. Those who have read Damascenus, if they have one ounce of sound judgment, will not defer much to his authority. Who knows not that ancient Christians were wont to give the Eucharist to infants at the breast? And they no doubt thought that the practice was founded on apostolic tradition! This Cyprian, who is considerably older than Chrysostom and Augustine, would

have said: but that the practice was perverse and alien to the institution of Christ is testified by Paul, when he says, "Let a man examine himself, and so eat of that bread or drink of that cup." (1 Cor. xi. 28.) In short, a posterior age, not without good reason, corrected it. Why then do our moderators make a gloss by falsely assuming the name of tradition, when in a similar case they plainly shew that this tradition, which they insist on being sacred, is to themselves lighter than a feather?

But of what use is it to keep guessing here? We have the Writings of the Apostles copiously and plainly detailing everything necessary to be known in the doctrine of godliness. Nay, they sometimes speak professedly of the dead. Nowhere do they command us to pray for them. When Paul exhorts the Thessalonians to moderate their grief for the death of their friends, (1 Thess. iv. 13,) he employs the consolations which he knew to be most appropriate to the occasion. There is not a word about prayers, though it would have been most seasonable, if it were lawful to pray for the dead. Writing to the Corinthians, he collects all the arguments by which he may prove that souls survive death. He does not adduce what would otherwise have been the strongest of all—that the Church with good reason prays for the dead. He reminds Timotheus of those for whom he would have ordinary prayer to be made in the Church. Of the dead, here too he is silent. (1 Tim. ii. 1.) If the dead need our prayers now, there was a greater necessity for them under the law. But Scripture, while it accurately relates the mourning and burial, and other matters apparently minute, says not a word of prayers. Who, I ask, can believe that the Holy Spirit forgets the principal, while dwelling on a minor point? Hence, men not given to contention, will see clearly that the thing was unknown to the Prophets and Apostles.

But our mediators also produce Scripture: for the Apostle commands us to pray one for another. (Jas. v. 16.) If they had any fear of God before them—had religion any weight—were conscience in any kind of vigour, they would certainly tremble at the punishment which we are forced to pray for against the impious corrupters of Holy Scripture, and which

God will doubtless one day inflict. James, after he had given injunctions about mutual confession, admonishes us to pray one for another. If in this class he comprehends the dead, it will be necessary for them to rise again and confess their sins to us, for he couples the one with the other! I retort the words of James upon them, and to much better purpose—that as he enjoins those only who labour together to communicate in mutual prayer, the dead who have already ceased from these labours, are excluded. James, I say, recommends none to our prayers but those who are still engaged in the struggles of the present life. On the other hand, the Scripture pronounces those blessed who have died in the Lord, because they now rest from their labours. If it is so, what assistance can our prayers give them?

And yet our mediators hesitate not to charge us with great cruelty to our brethren, and great presumption towards God, if we exclude the dead from the fellowship of our prayers. Nay, rather let them charge God with cruelty, who at the very time when he so carefully exhorts us to pray for the brethren, always restricts it to the living. The relief of wretched souls who cannot speak to implore assistance was not so light a matter as to be passed over. Why is there not a single allusion to it, the more especially while all the Prophets and Apostles, and, in fine, Christ himself, discourse so carefully, so copiously, so clearly; in the offices of charity, why do they suppress this, certainly not the last? Then how presumptuously do they act with reference to our Lord? He delivers a certain rule for prayer. We hold by it: we think it unlawful to deviate from it one nail's breadth.

But the Lord, they say, by no means enjoins us to separate the dead from the living. Yes, it ought to be as a precept to us, that while he everywhere expressly mentions the living, he separates the dead from among them, and then, by declaring that their warfare is ended, intimates that they no more need our help. God nowhere prohibits us from praying for angels. Shall we detest him who refuses to pray for them? Our mediators themselves admit that we are not to pray for Apostles and martyrs. But a prohibition is nowhere read. Why, then, in regard to the other dead, should our inference

be so detestable? But they themselves openly insult the Holy Spirit, whom they virtually charge with forgetfulness in so necessary a matter. From the whole, it appears how great the moderation of those is who so futilely vent their detestation against us.

Be it so, however; let the custom of the ancient Church prevail, let the priest in the celebration of the Supper recommend the dead to God; are therefore Vigils, Anniversaries, and like follies, to be retained? So it pleases our mediators. I ask whether, if they had any care about renewing godliness and the Church, they would cut down nothing at all in the large forest of superstition, with which Vigils for the Dead, as they call them, abound? Nay, if they had any ingenuous shame, would they not admit, in word at least that some things require correction, which, by their excessive absurdity, give offence to any man of moderate intelligence? Then Scripture is shamefully torn to pieces. An indigested farrago of sentences, gathered here and there at random, is huddled together. In short, everything done and said there is a gross corruption of Scripture. All this our mediators not only disguise, but acquit by their vote. But let us hear their admirable reason: "How cruel were it," they say, "to suppress the memory of the dead, as if their souls perished with the body!" Therefore, for four thousand years before the advent of Christ, and more than a thousand years thereafter, there was no belief in the immortality of the soul! Certainly, if we subscribe to this blasphemy, all the patriarchs that have ever been from the beginning of the world, all the prophets who lived under the law, pious kings, and others, Christ, his Apostles, the whole martyrs, will be Epicureans, because they used no vigils to shew that souls do not perish.

In regard to Abstaining from Meats, they seem to themselves most admirably to correct any superstitions that have hitherto been, when they teach that it is submitted to because of temperance, and not from abhorrence. Did all delicacies consist in the mere eating of flesh, their allegation might perhaps be conceded; but who knows not that in the kitchens of the rich the repasts are much more luxurious during ab-

stinence from flesh? The poor, who seldom taste bacon or beef, there is certainly no need to prohibit from eating flesh, for the sake of taming their flesh. The rich alone require a law to bring them back to frugality. But, as has been said, there is nothing which the prohibition of flesh less is than a restraint on luxury and expense; for then their kitchens send forth most smoke, then their extravagant tables overflow. In short, they are never less temperate in their diet than when they abstain from flesh.

Doubly ridiculous, then, are our mediators, who place frugality in Abstinence from flesh, as if there were no voluptuous eatables but flesh, and pretend it to be a wholesome remedy for taming the flesh, as if their tables were not covered with more savoury dainties on the sixth day of the week than on the second. Hence it is evidently more than absurd to distinguish flesh, on this account, from other kinds of food, as if by withholding flesh luxurious living were restrained, and a method discovered of mortifying the flesh, whereas the very variety of the food is a new stimulus to the appetites of those who have already eaten to the full.

But granting that it has the effect, in some degree, still the superstitious observance of days does not cease. Our mediators make the excuse that, in old times, the early Church interdicted the use of flesh both on Friday and Saturday, that men prepared by such abstinence might come in a holier state to the sacred table! It is certain, from ancient history, that nothing of the kind was enjoined. Eusebius speaks of the fast which was observed at Rome on the Saturday as an unusual thing. Abstinence from flesh, indeed, gradually insinuated itself by the private superstition of individuals. At first it seized upon the Friday, and then extended to the Saturday, until at length the custom became a law, and compelled the unwilling also to obey.

But as it belongs not to my purpose to treat this subject at length, it will suffice briefly to point out four vices which are contained in this prohibition.

First, insult is offered to God when the Eating of Flesh is interdicted, even on certain days. God destined flesh, not less than vegetables, and fish, and fruit, for our use. All these

he created that we might eat and give him thanks. Of all these, I say, he permitted us the free and promiscuous use, provided it be sober and frugal. Men afterwards arise, who deprive us of this liberty, making that unlawful which God willed to be lawful. Remember that everything of the nature of flesh is forbidden, though there are many sorts of it very remote from delicacy and luxury, so that they displease for no other reason than just because they have the name of flesh.

Secondly, such an Observance of Days is not free from superstition. They think they pay respect to the death and burial of Christ by not tasting flesh on those two days. Feast days are held in the same honour, not only those dedicated to God, but to Apostles or martyrs. If those are deservedly censured who distinguish between day and day, who does not see that to make abstinence from flesh imperative on certain days, is superstitious? Although they do not expressly mention Lent, yet, as they sanction anew all customary fasts, without exception, it also is restored entire. But on what ground principally is it wont to be recommended, but just on the imitation of Christ? If it is imitation, why is it repeated every year, when our Saviour fasted thus only once in his life? If it is an example which we ought to follow, there was the same reason for following that of Moses and Eli. Why then did so many holy kings and prophets neglect the imitation? Certainly the whole ancient Church must have incurred no small guilt. Why also did our Lord himself, when he was on earth, not allow some regard to be paid to his example among the disciples? He excuses them for not fasting. It is painful to waste words on so clear a matter.

Our mediators themselves are aware that it was a childish error in those who first supposed that they were imitating the forty days' Fast of Christ, when they observed any kind of abstinence. For how widely does this differ from not eating for forty days? Moreover, where is the example of temperance, where there is neither hunger nor desire for food? For it is a great mistake to suppose that our Saviour then struggled with hunger, whereas he was exempted from the necessity of eating. Christ did not undertake that fast till he was more

than thirty years of age. He undertook it when about to enter on the office received from the Father. He undertook it that he might obtain not less credit for the gospel than the law had previously obtained. In short, it was a singular specimen of divine power, which behoved to be displayed in himself, and by which it behoved him to be distinguished from others. To cherish a contrary error, were there no other harm in it, is by no means accordant with Christian sincerity.

Thirdly, I come to the *third* vice, which surpasses the former two. In this way both is a snare laid for consciences and liberty taken away—liberty not only granted by our Lord, but also purchased by his blood. Paul seriously admonishes us not to bring ourselves under the yoke of bondage, but to stand fast in the liberty whereunto we have been called. (1 Cor. vii. 23.) But liberty is not only attacked, but entirely overthrown, when a spiritual law to bind the conscience is imposed upon us. As to the political reason which our mediators introduce, viz., that men are to be kept occasionally from flesh, lest they should consume the cattle by constant eating, they make themselves more than ridiculous even to babes. No doubt, when God permitted men to eat flesh at any time, he acted inconsiderately, by not providing against this danger: and those have provided best for the cattle kind, who after four thousand years have curtailed the former freedom of eating. It is strange that, in the meantime, men were so stupid as not to perceive a diminution of animals compelling them to a speedier remedy, especially while they consumed a great number in sacrifices. But this is not the subject in hand. The law they confirm is not a political but a spiritual one, by which necessity is laid upon the conscience. I hold it intolerable for men thus to usurp dominion over souls, and make that unlawful which the Lord left free.

Fourthly, the *fourth* vice is in the false idea of Divine Worship. For whatever our mediators may pretend, any observance recommended as necessary is forthwith considered as belonging to the worship of God. Of this fact we need not go far for an example. Who does not think that Abstinence from flesh is a part of religion? And this is the reason

why Paul says that they hypocritically deceive and lie who introduce a new form of godliness under a prohibition of meats. (1 Tim. iv. 2, 3.) For when he teaches, in another place, that the kingdom of God is not in meat and in drink, he justly charges such enactments in regard to external things with hypocrisy. (Rom. xiv. 17.)

Inward truth of heart alone, I say, is what the Lord requires. Any exercises which are added are to be approved so far as they are subservient to truth, or as useful incitements, or as marks of profession to attest our faith to men. Nor, meantime, do we reject things which tend to the preservation of order and discipline. But when consciences are put under fetters, and bound by religious obligations, in matters in which God willed them to be free, we must boldly protest, in order that the worship of God may not be vitiated by human fictions, nor mortal man, who should be subject to the law, seize on the tribunal of the one Lawgiver, (James iv. 12,) and assert dominion over consciences, over which Christ alone ought to reign. In short, let us hear what Paul says, (Col. ii. 20,) "If we are dead to the elements of this world by Christ, it is unbecoming to be bound by such decrees as, Eat not, taste not, touch not." When once any one has given way to the superstition of thinking it unlawful to eat flesh, he forthwith follows it up by boldness in condemning others. This boldness, though wearing the specious name of zeal, is akin to sacrilege, and is usually accompanied with that preposterous admiration of empty worthless traditions, of which Christ complains as making void the commandments of God.

Marriage is forgiven to Priests like a discharge on cause among soldiers. Ministers who are already entangled in Marriage they dare not tear from their wives by sudden divorce, lest greater commotions should arise, but they restrict their indulgence till the period of a General Council. Two things are here to be carefully observed—the Marriage of ministers is not permitted because it is approved, but only from fear of disturbances, and nothing is resolved till the Council shall determine. The reason which they allege for not being satisfied with the Marriage of priests is, be-

cause, according to Paul, (1 Cor. vii. 32,) he who is unmarried cares better, and with an easier mind, for the things of the Lord. I hear what Paul says; but does he on this account compel pastors and ministers of the Church to celibacy? He does not even advise them to it, except as each in his own case shall acknowledge its expediency.

Our mediators could wish that many clergy were found who could observe true chastity in celibacy. It were well to be wished, I confess; but since experience teaches otherwise, of what use is it to wrestle in vain with necessity? We see that, at the time when the greatest sanctity flourished among Christians, the ministers of the Church were not bound to celibacy. It is certain that the Apostles, while they had no fixed station anywhere, chose to carry their wives about with them rather than dismiss them from their society: so Paul relates. We cannot listen to the puerile quibble that they followed their husbands in order that they might live together at the public expense of the Church. How? Could they not have been maintained by the public fund without eating at a common table?

Paul, again, when he draws the portrait of a true bishop complete in all its parts, and enumerates the endowments in which he ought chiefly to excel, makes no mention of celibacy. This is little. He expressly advises the choice of such as, contented with a single wife, chastely observe conjugal fidelity, as are reputable heads of families, as train up their children in the fear of the Lord. That this is the true and entire perfection of a bishop after Paul's model, cannot be denied. Whoever thinks that something is wanting to the ministers of the Church unless they live in celibacy, let him have to himself some other form of Church government than that which the Son of God has recommended.

To leave the matter less doubtful, the Spirit of God, in another place, distinctly declares that "Marriage is honourable in all." (Heb. xiii. 4.) In quoting this passage, the mediators wickedly corrupt it. They omit the principal member of the sentence, "in all." Would the Apostle have advanced anything new, if he had simply said—there is no

disgrace in marriage? No such superstition had yet arisen, either among Jews or Gentiles, as to fix a stigma on it: but as, perchance, some morose individuals were extravagantly lauding celibacy as in itself a holier state, Paul, while he denounces fearful vengeance from God on whoremongers and adulterers, at the same time proposes, as the remedy for incontinence, that each should have his own wife; and, that none might despise marriage, he testifies that marriage is honourable in all—thereby intimating that no man is endued with such passing virtues that marriage may not become him, and that there is no function, however noble, with which it is incompatible.

Whence, then, came this new sanctity? We shall find that it originated with Montanus, the Encratites, and the like. They were indeed long since condemned; yet Satan obtained, that though the persons were condemned, the impious error was half approved. Sozomen relates, (Tripartit. Hist. lib. i. c. 14,) that it was mooted in the Council of Nice, but Paphnutius the martyr interposed at that time, saying, that though he was himself free from the Marriage tie, it was chastity for a man to cohabit with his own wife.

Our mediators, not to seem too severe against Marriage, advise the toleration of those ministers who cannot be induced to repudiate the wives they have; at the same time they carefully guard against seeming to approve their cause, by wishing the concession to be made to them merely, lest they should excite tumult if too hard pressed. In this way Islebius keeps his concubine, lest, if violently torn from her, he should sound the trumpet of war. His excessive desire of vain glory certainly makes him a fit subject to bear this insult. But I wonder that our moderators are so devoid of shame, that they would, without hesitation, dissolve the sacred bond of Marriage, could they do it without the risk of more grievous commotion.

Here I am again forced briefly to repeat what I formerly adverted to. While they insist, in deference to the Sacrament, that Marriage contracted between young people, though gone into contrary to law and right, shall yet remain valid, what incongruous levity is it to pay no respect to the

Sacrament when the question is the Marriage of priests? Let us, however, while we hear from the lips of Paul that the prohibition of Marriage is a devilish device, (1 Tim. iv. 1, 3,) boldly call these devils twice over, who, in defending this tyranny, attempt to profane Marriage consecrated by the name of God.

Not to be too liberal, they add, that the decision of the Council must be waited for. What, then! Should the Council declare that the Marriage of ministers are not to be confirmed, shall the will of man forthwith lawfully put asunder those whom God hath joined? In this way, verily, the ordinance of God, which ought to be inviolable, is subjected to human decisions. Unless they would expunge the Prophets, Apostles, and flower of holy pastors from the list of God's servants, they cannot deny that the marriage of priests is approved of God and blessed. The decision of God now stands, that husband and wife, leaving their parents, if need be, shall be twain in one flesh. By these words Moses intimates that this covenant is so pre-eminently holy, that the strongest natural tie must yield precedence to it. What audacity, then, is it to set at nought that which has been so strictly sanctioned by God?

Besides, when they shall have made celibacy imperative, who is to give continence? Unless they would openly gainsay Christ and Paul, they will be forced to confess that continence is a special gift, and therefore rare, possessed by very few. All who possess it not, if they reject the remedy of marriage, will gain nothing by fighting with God: for however much external excess may be restrained, lust will swell and boil within. Hence miserable disquietude of conscience, which will not allow a man to attempt anything with a tranquil mind, and, as Paul expresses it, in accordance with faith. The result will be, that a clerical brood will immediately be hatched similar to that which this impure celibacy has now for many years been producing. Never, therefore, let us willingly permit the Church to be put under a fetter, which will not only keep back from the ministry the pious and otherwise best qualified, who will cultivate pure chastity of mind and body in holy wedlock,

but also pollute the whole order of the priesthood with a foul and fetid deluge.

In regard to Ceremonies, while the number of them is almost infinite, and a great part are stuffed with foolish and absurd superstitions, our mediators, while willing to preserve them, apply correction gently in a single word, though it were better to have been altogether silent than to have made such a frivolous semblance of amendment. They remind us that the secret operations which they imagine to lie under their operations are to be attributed to God—not to the things themselves: as if the abuse of the name of God were not ever the fountain of all superstition. If credit is given to their words, we will believe that lustral water has power, not in itself, but from God, to expel demons and ward off every kind of harm. Here indeed mention is made of the power of God, but it is confined to a small drop of water. A thousand other things of the same stamp I omit, as from these it will be easy to judge what modification of the poison is prepared by our mediators.

In another place it is added, that there are to be no superstitious flockings to images. But by these very terms idolaters have license to run up and down; for if they insist that there is no superstition, the attempt to define will place us in a dilemma. As if there were not manifest proved superstition in such flocking, they, by fixing blame on some, indirectly exculpate all others. See the sincere zeal by which they are actuated.

They say that the worship of *latria* is not to be given to Crosses and Banners. What does this mean? That the thing is to be done as it was done before. For this is the answer which the Papists use as a common charm to excuse all kinds of false worship, while they refrain from using the word *latria*. The quibble indeed is futile in the extreme—to feign worship without worship. *Latria* in Greek means exactly the same thing as *cultus* in Latin. Those, therefore, who affirm that they do not give *latria* to the Images which they adore on account of religion, just speak as if they were to say that a man is not ἄνθρωπος, nor an animal, ζῶον. We may now perceive what kind of gloss these wor-

thy men make for us out of one vocable. Provided the Greek word for worship be kept away, they do not disapprove of the worship of full grown Images, and they gently fondle little ones. In short, no idolatry displeases them, provided it be not called *latria*.

Be the obloquy or ignominy which we must endure from the ignorant as well as the wicked what it may, we must strenuously resist such imposture. Too costly will be the reputation that is purchased at the price of such perfidious silence. The loss not of fame merely, but of life also, must be submitted to with unflinching courage. Meanwhile I have no fear that those who are truly pious, and who having embraced the truth of God with becoming zeal, hold it with equal firmness, will think me too vehement in assailing this farrago of impiety, an impiety the more detestable, in that while it exhibits itself under the name of a specious moderation, it tarnishes all the glory of God, and with it the grace of Christ and the salvation of men.

Hence, when I lately received a copy of the Antidote of Robert Cenalis to the propositions which he calls the Interim, at first I wondered exceedingly what new genius could have impelled one, born to approve evil, to draw his pen against those impious blasphemies of which he ought, after his usual manner, to have professed himself the advocate. The Robert of whom I speak is an old theologaster of Sorbonne, and Bishop of Auvergne. I reflected, indeed, that men of not very sound heads not only fall into dotage by years, but also become more sour tempered. I was aware, moreover, of the haughty superciliousness, the fierce pertinacity of the Doctors of Sorbonne, whose usual weapons are fire and bloodshed. But when, on the other hand, I saw that the tract which he had undertaken to refute teems with so many corruptions, and is compiled of so many impostures, that it leaves nothing pure or entire in the doctrine of godliness, throws clouds of darkness over the clear light, sometimes equals, sometimes prefers the decrees of men to Divine laws, and, in short, contains almost a total revival of the Papacy, it seemed odd that it should be so violently assailed by Cenalis, one of the keen satellites of the Pope.

If it was not plausible in every part, there was nothing in it greatly to excite his stomach.

While hesitating among various conjectures, I cursorily turned over the volume. Here I perceive that the miserable dotard, while hunting for something to fight with, has taken much trouble to lash his own shadow. He has this excellence above the others he herds with, that he is versed in the poets. By this he has so far profited, that he not only stuffs his discourses with numerous lines from them, but in his own composition is ever and anon breaking out into hemistichs, pleased exceedingly, I have no doubt, with the jingle. For were he not pleased, he would not toil at it so anxiously. He had, as far as one may guess, gathered some flowers of this sort, and he saw that if he did not get them speedily disposed of they must perish. But he was unwilling that they should perish with him, and while many eagerly carry their glory with them to the tomb, Robert, who, of course, is not in the least degree vainglorious, wished rather to leave his with the living. For when he could not find any subject to write upon, he fabricated for himself a kind of supposititious monster, to which he gave the name of INTERIM, that in routing it he might make full trial of his strength.

These propositions, which he gossipingly alleged to be from the Protestants, he either feigned for himself, or some wit palmed upon him as a hoax. But whether he came to the contest on his own invitation, or some one abusing his foolish credulity stirred up his bile for him, he sweats not less copiously than ridiculously in fighting a ghost. Afterwards, indeed, though kindly admonished by a friend, that the Interim which he assails never proceeded from the Protestants, but was composed as a *jeu d'esprit* by some tavern-ing buffoon, as numerous squibs of that sort are daily flying about, he chose rather to be laughed at for his levity and stupidity in believing, than to lose labour so well applied. Any person possessed of common sense will perceive at the very first glance, that the propositions he quotes have not the least semblance of being genuine. Hence it will be easy to infer, that the good old man is enraged without

cause at his own shadow. But what we cannot pardon in this Bishop-doctor of Sorbonne is, that in discussing trifles feigned by I know not whom, he rashly creates disturbance in the world. Perhaps he may answer, that by a kind of privilege bishops have a license to be silly, and Sorbonnists to rant, the greater part of them having been long used to it.

It is not my present purpose to examine the Bishop's book, and yet I cannot refrain from dipping a little into it. Grave authors are quoted, by whose weight heretics are borne down, by whose splendour they are extinguished, before whose majesty they all fall prostrate. There is Ivo Carnotensis, Speculator, the Abbot of Panorma, Isidorus, Thomas Aquinas, Pope Boniface, Nicolaus, &c. &c. What then? he makes oracles of the bought responses of Speculator. Who will not promise the victory to a combatant so well provided? But he himself, without waiting for the plaudits of others, ever and anon chants his own triumph in joyous acclamations. And to complete his Areopagus, he adds Cochlaeus to the number. Cochlaeus, who surpasses all cockles in dulness, that is, in so far as the male should surpass the female, is here called a most sagacious discerner of spirits. They are, indeed, a worthy couple to sound each other's praises: for scarcely could a pair of fools be better fitted, search all France and Germany!

But what are the matters about which Cenalis debates? He says it is intolerable that the patrimony of the Church should be retained by Protestants. What then? Does he wish it bestowed for any lawful purpose? Nay, he allows no account to be taken of the Poor, and no provision to be made for Schools. He only urges the restitution of what has been carried off, that the stomachs of priests and monks may be stuffed! How much better then would it have been for a herd than a Bishop to have this great care of swine? I pass over many things as to which he fights without an opponent. One is, that he will not allow a Legate to be sent to pardon the Protestants who abjure. But all good men with whom alone Cenalis is incensed, make the Roman Legate welcome to remain at home!

One head on which he rages furiously is, when he treats

of the Marriage of priests. After launching all the thunders of his eloquence, that is, giving vent to all the invectives that a petulant mad fellow could think of, he at length shouts to arms—let the earth be sooner covered with blood than behold such atrocity, as he explains it. But how comes it that he so much detests the marriages of priests as incestuous, sacrilegious, impure, disdigamous, and obscene? He answers, because we are enjoined to walk in the Spirit, and not to fulfil the lusts of the flesh. But those words of Paul apply to all Christians without exception. We see then how this dog defames holy marriage by his blasphemous bark. For if we must live in celibacy, in order to walk in the Spirit, who can doubt that marriage must be banished from the Church? This blasphemy, indeed, the Pope learned from his Serycius. But what fury drives them to subscribe openly to Montanus, the Encratites, and the Manichees?

Cenalis exclaims, that it is great improbity, great flagitiousness, fearful sacrilege, to draw luxury and carnal delights into the sanctuary of Divine laws. Why then does he allow luxury and delights to revel so in his own house, unless, indeed, it be that Divine laws have been exiled from it? But who does not see that the man is wrong in his mind when he fears not so petulantly to pour out malediction on holy Marriage? What! will he say that the tents of the patriarchs, and the houses of prophets and pious kings, were profane receptacles of luxury? Can he find nothing but luxury in the households of the Apostles? What sanctuaries of celestial philosophy were ever purer? But we read that they were married. Nay, the Spirit of God enumerates it among the highest of their praises that they brought up their families piously and in chaste discipline.

Again, he exclaims, What madness, what delirium, to immerse in carnal cares and desires those who should cultivate nothing but purity! I speak not of the wickedness with which, as if struck with devilish insanity, he ever and anon defames honourable Marriage. What madness is like his own in stigmatizing as mad and delirious all who approve of marriage in the sacerdotal order, when it is certain that it was approved in the Church for more than 300 years?

When Paul prescribes after the most perfect pattern what kind of persons bishops ought to be, (1 Tim. iii. 2,) he expressly commends the married. For he does not say, "who were," but mentions their present state. With whom does he think that he has to do when he vents his foul maledictions against the Spirit of God, speaking by the mouth of Paul?

Paul also testifies, (1 Cor. ix. 5,) that the Apostles not only continued to live with the wives they had, but carried them about with them. And the whole Church, when it was in its highest perfection, not to offer insult to God, the author of marriage, and to the Prophets and Apostles, had for its pastors husbands and heads of families. About 200 years after, when fanatics wished to make celibacy imperative on priests, the holy martyr Paphnutius, who had lived a bachelor to extreme old age, eagerly interposed, and by his authority prevailed with the Council of Nice to leave marriage free to priests as formerly. Now this frantic man, trusting to the horns which he carries in his mitre, as if he saw the sun falling from the skies, stands amazed at the thing as monstrous. And these execrable blasphemies against the Spirit are received with great applause.

He afterwards proceeds to pour forth his vile sentences. For in order to prove that he has read Ovid, he wrests what that heathen says of unchaste love to holy Marriage; "Conjugal delights, he says, and a mind elevated to God, do not well agree nor stay in one house." Therefore, according to this animal, neither the prophets, nor holy fathers, nor Apostles, nor infinite numbers of martyrs, ever raised their minds to heaven. Therefore Moses, to whom, above others, it was given to stand before God, and see him as it were face to face, kept his mind bent on the earth, and never had any taste of heavenly grace. Of a similar stamp is his saying, that those who allow priests to marry follow the way of Balaam; as if there were no difference between entering into honourable and pious wedlock, in the chaste fear of God, and introducing Midianitish harlots among the people of God, in order to seduce them to idolatry. He, moreover, calls all married priests Nicolaitans, as if he who in marrying

one wife seeks a remedy for the various unrestrained lusts which now prevail throughout the Papacy were making wives common and committing prostitution.

But this worthy Doctor denies the necessity of the remedy for continence which Paul by the Spirit of God enjoins: for he maintains that all who wish it can be exempted from burning, because it is written, "I can do all things in him who strengtheneth me." (Phil. iv. 13.) But he considers not, on the other hand, that Christ is the helper of those only who obey his call. Therefore, to experience that victorious power of Christ in all things, we must depend on the command of God, no one taking more upon himself than he permits. And what does Paul say? He openly declares that the gift of continence is not given to all in common, and that all who labour under incontinence should betake themselves to marriage that they may not burn. (1 Cor. vii. 9.) What does Christ himself say? When the Apostles, on hearing celibacy praised, said that it was a happy kind of life, he declares that all are not capable of it, (Matt. xix. 11,) thereby intimating that those only are fit who are specially called to it by God.

It hence appears that the laws which prohibit Marriage in those whom the Spirit of God expressly invites to it, are the very last to be called ecclesiastical. Apollonius, a very ancient writer, as Eusebius testifies, censures Montanus for having first dissolved marriages, and first taught to dissolve them. They shew themselves to be his disciples when they neither wish marriages to be contracted according to the ordinance of God, nor allow those contracted to be confirmed.

Moreover, Cenalis, not to seem to rave without reason, reminds us that the world would be oppressed by the multitude of its inhabitants, were not excessive population kept down by celibacy. The subtle Doctor here speaks as if there were no difference between celibacy and continence. But all know that no seed is so fertile in propagating mankind as the sacerdotal: for to such a degree has the untamed lust of almost all monks and popish priests burst forth, that he is justly deemed chastest who is satisfied with a harlot in his house. Wherefore, if the object is to prevent them from

replenishing the earth, they must not only be prevented from marrying, but made physically incapable of it. Otherwise, what has long been notorious will never cease; instead of two lawful children the land will be burdened with the rearing of three bastards.

Had not Cenalis all his acumen in his episcopal mitre, he never would have thus exposed himself to the ridicule even of children. For what, I ask, can be fitter for laughter than to send bulls into the pasture to graze and fatten at their ease, in order to prevent a surplus of offspring? But the madness is still greater in this, that while the Lord calls the propagation of the human race his blessing, Cenalis orders it to be cut down by the knife as an unfortunate excrescence, and as if children were the offspring of chance, is afraid that their numbers may be carried to excess. The sacrilegious presumption of such men well deserves to plunge deeper and deeper into all kinds of absurdities. If God once avenged the contempt of holy marriage by monstrous examples of abominable lust, how much severer punishment is due to the contumelious insults in which this ungovernable animal vents his bacchanalian rage?

But that Cenalis may answer to his name, he again rolls back to the kitchen. He says, If three benefices scarcely suffice a solitary individual, how will one be enough for a numerous family? Were he not more than a dolt, would not the answer at once occur to him, that economy, to which the heads of families are more accustomed, is the best revenue, whereas expensive parties are those common with the solitaries of whom he boasts. A husband will live frugally with his wife and children, so as to leave something over even out of a slender income; but Papist priests, before they have satisfied harlots, bastards, pimps, and pimpesses, will have spent much larger revenues than would have served many honest families. Why should I enumerate the profuse luxuries into which they throw whatever they can seize or scrape from any quarter as into inexhaustible whirlpools, so that they seem ingenious only in squandering money? The more they abound the more do they inundate the world with their corruptions.

But in order to curry favour with his thrice beneficed associates, he styles those vertiginous, who confine each priest to a single benefice! Certainly, O good father, you must have been either drunk or well saturated, when such vertigo seized your brain, that you dared to disapprove of this arrangement, which even those of the greatest audacity and the least probity are not only forced to admit to be agreeable to reason, but order to be observed as a dictate of nature. After this miscreant has vented all the blasphemies which he could find in his Sorbonne, he at last raises his horns and sends forth the Thrasonic boast, that he is ready to descend into the arena, and if need be, fight even unto blood. I, for my part, doubt not that a man of his sanguinary temper, if all the servants of God were to be butchered, and the innocent blood of men and women alike were to be shed, would willingly become a standard-bearer, though he has learned to spare his own blood. When we see this Cyclops no less pertinaciously persisting in assailing the truth, than burning with mad hatred against it, we are more than base and flagitious if we shew less constancy in confessing the pure faith.

But to return to the show of adulterine Reformation, seeing it is manifest that all purity of sound doctrine is there corrupted, how shall any one who allows himself to be hoodwinked by it prove himself to be a Christian? I indeed see the dangers which beset all who will ingenuously confess Christ; the obloquy which they incur among the undiscerning; the ignominy which awaits them in time to come. But I have already reminded them, that no calamity, however great, ought to turn us aside from that doctrine in which the glory of God and the salvation of the whole world are contained.

Whatever pretexts may be sought out on this hand and on that, by those who in the present day are more ingenious than they ought in excusing their effeminacy, it were most unworthy in us to pay a greater regard to our own reputation than to the glory of God, to defer to the foolish and presumptuous opinions of men, rather than look to Christ, sole Judge of heaven and earth, and through him to all angels and

saints who submit to his authority; to think less of the blessedness and immortality which have been promised us, and laid up in heaven, than of the world and this transitory life. The time now demands that the faith which we have hitherto professed with the tongue and pen shall be sealed with our blood. Long ago, if we had duly profited in the school of Christ, must this thought have been present to our minds. Our first experience is a kind of apprenticeship by which he trains his own to deny themselves, and take up his cross, and hasten with unwearied course to death, but now we are just as great novices in enduring danger for the testimony of the gospel, as if the Son of God, instead of constantly inculcating it upon us, had never said a word about it.

In the old time, when Caius Caligula ordered his statue to be set up in the Temple of Jerusalem, the Jews from all quarters, like hives of bees, rushed to the Prefect, not to prevent the sacrilege by force and violence, but to place their necks beneath his swords in vindication of the majesty of the Temple. Nor was that a sudden impulse which immediately calmed down, but as often as the profanation of the Temple was threatened, an almost innumerable multitude of women, as well as men, forgetting themselves, cheerfully offered to die, leaving no passage to the idol excepting over their slaughtered bodies. And shall we, having not a temple of stone in which God may be invoked, but the Son of God, in whom the whole majesty of the Father dwells, silently suffer him to be so shamefully profaned? For an Idol is set up, not to deform the external appearance of the sanctuary, but to defile and destroy the whole sanctity of the Church, to overthrow the entire worship of God, and leave nothing in our religion unpolluted.

If we descend to more recent times, how many thousands of martyrs have persisted, with invincible fortitude, with the worst terrors of death immediately in their eye? Why do I speak of terrors? Did they not, by death itself, intrepidly testify that they sought and hoped with assurance for another life? And at that time, too, as soon as a feeble spark of light had beamed upon men, their whole heart

burned with such longing for celestial life, that they easily contemned this life and its death. Now, when the full brightness of intelligence shines upon us, no cordiality appears.

Do we hope for salvation from the gospel while no man is willing to run any risk in asserting its truth? The more than perfidious cowardice which the experience of one year has betrayed is too clear evidence of our ingratitude, so that there is no longer occasion to ask why in so many cities and provinces the purity of Christianity is gone. For why should the inestimable blessing of God be longer enjoyed by those who set it at nought?

These things I say, in order that all who are touched with any feeling of piety may remember that God is, as with outstretched hand, calling them to die. And that their courage fail not, let them doubt not that it is far happier for them to cast in their lot with the Church when smitten and in distress, than by acting with excessive caution, and consulting their private tranquillity, to seek a lot apart from the children of God. It was once said by one who had instant death in his eye, that old age made him feel free, and that in a case where freedom was of less consequence. Shall the eternity of future life have less weight with us for the defence of the glory of Christ than the shortness of the present life had with him? It may shame us as often as we hear the voice of the female who is introduced by the heathen poet, asking, "Is it so very miserable a thing to die?" if we hesitate in suspense to bear testimony to our faith whenever any danger appears. For myself, conscious as I am of my own weakness, still, by the help of God, I trust, that when the occasion demands it, I shall be able to shew how firmly I have believed, and do believe, that "blessed are the dead that die in the Lord."

APPENDIX TO THE TRACT

ON

THE TRUE METHOD OF REFORMING THE CHURCH:

IN WHICH CALVIN REFUTES THE CENSURE OF AN ANONYMOUS PRINTER ON THE SANCTIFICATION OF INFANTS AND BAPTISM BY WOMEN.

A YEAR is now almost gone since it was intimated to me that my Tract on The True and Genuine Reformation of the Church, which at first by my order proceeded from our own press, was reprinted in Germany. But now only, later than I ought, have I been informed that the German copy was corrupted and mutilated, and not only so, but that a censure was added, in which I am fiercely assailed. As the Printer conceals his name, I have no one with whom I can expostulate. Nor do I think this of much consequence. Perhaps some one, after having well drunk, has exhaled upon me the fumes of his wine or cherry-brandy; or it may be, that some one of turbulent brain, though fasting, has made an assault upon me. As to the man, then, be he who he may, I say nothing. As to the thing, it is altogether intolerable that, after I have faithfully and seriously exerted myself on some work, an unknown bookseller should, at his own hand, cut away whatever does not please him, and give forth a mutilated work as complete. But that I may not seem to plead my own private cause, I supersede this complaint likewise, and shall only briefly advert to what I think concerns the whole Church, as here disguise is unlawful.

I hope I may without arrogance, and with the permission of all good men, boast this much—that my labours are moderately useful to the Church. Now, if I allow them to be stigmatized, as containing false and impious doctrine, I see that much of the benefit which the children of God

might gather from them will be impaired. By remaining silent, therefore, I would shew that I pay less regard than I ought to the public good, especially when those who traduce me are counted among the Lord's flock. I care little for avowed enemies, who must of necessity keep calling me *heretic*, if I would be regarded as a Christian. I admit even that it is, as it were, the destiny of the servants of God to hear their good evil spoken of. Nor ought I to decline the condition of going forward with Paul through good report and bad report. But as often as place and means are given, the defence of a good cause is not to be neglected. Then, while it clearly appears to me that the doctrine assailed is sound and taken from the pure word of God, having once delivered it, I am no longer at liberty to leave it unsupported. For the Lord hath appointed us ministers of his doctrine with this proviso, that we are to be as firm in defending as faithful in delivering it.

In my Tract I used the following words, "In regard to Baptism, it is worth while to observe, that what they say of the absolute necessity of Baptism had better been omitted. For besides erroneously annexing the salvation of the soul to external signs, no small injury is done to the promise, as if it were insufficient to give the salvation which it offers unless aided from some other quarter. The offspring of believers are born holy, because their children, while yet in the womb, before they breathe the vital air, have been adopted into the covenant of eternal life. Nor are they brought into the Church by Baptism on any other ground than because they belonged to the body of the Church before they were born. He who admits aliens to Baptism profanes it. Now, then, those who hold Baptism to be so necessary, that they exclude from the hope of salvation all who have not been dipt by it, both insult God, and involve themselves in great absurdity. For how can it be lawful to confer the sacred badge of Christ on aliens from Christ? Baptism must, therefore, be preceded by the gift of adoption, which is not the cause of a half salvation merely, but gives salvation entire: and this salvation is afterwards ratified by Baptism. Hence, as error usually springs from error, the office of bap-

tizing, which Christ specially committed to the ministers of the Church alone, they delegate not only to any one among the people, but even to women."

This passage is attacked by my concealed censor, and in such a way, that he charges me with reviving a gross error of Pelagius. But he is himself too gross in not distinguishing light from darkness. Pelagius thought the Baptism of Infants superfluous, because he pretended that they were free from sin. Nay, there was properly no discussion with him about Paedobaptism. But when the holy Fathers, in order to prove original sin, appealed to the practice of the Church in baptizing children, and thence inferred that all the posterity of Adam bring liability to eternal death with them from the womb, this desperate man was driven to his last asylum, viz., that infants did not need Baptism, because they were born without sin.

I ask, what affinity to the error of Pelagius can be found in my words? Do I exempt Children from the guilt of sin? Do I place salvation in what is called original righteousness, and the integrity of nature? Do I deny that they are received into the Church by the free mercy of God? Do I not everywhere contend that forgiveness of sins is necessary to them also, and that it is sealed by Baptism? I presume it is now clear enough how very ignorant my censor is, who pretends to have discovered the error of Pelagius, in a mode of speaking so very different from his. Certainly he has either never seen the writings of Augustine, or not had judgment enough to perceive what was the opinion of Pelagius. My belief is, that the man knows nothing of antiquity, and has only learned the name of the ancient heretic by common hearsay.

He errs no less in this, that from not observing the state of the question, he gives his arguments at random to the wind. If any one at this time maintains Paedobaptism keenly, and on strong grounds, I am certainly in the number. As to the cause or end, there is no controversy that they are baptized in order that, being ingrafted into the body of Christ, they may be freed from eternal death, obtain the forgiveness of the sin engendered in them by nature, and be

clothed with a free righteousness. Of this fact clear evidence is given by my Institutes, the Catechism, and the regular Form which I have drawn up for the daily use of our Church. Where, then, lies our difference? In this—that I disapprove of the absolute necessity, which they urge too strongly, and do not admit that a child who, from sudden death, has not been able to be presented for baptism, is therefore excluded from the kingdom of God.

I do not derogate from the efficacy of Baptism: I do not obscure the legitimate use of it; I only do not allow the salvation of the soul to be so tied to the sign as to make the Divine promise insufficient. The Children of believers, before they were begotten, were adopted by the Lord when he said, "I will be your God, and the God of your seed." (Gen. xvii. 7.) That in this promise the Baptism of Infants is included is absolutely certain. He who is not satisfied with it offers gross insult to God. He challenges his truth when he derogates from the efficacy of his word. The answer of Christ removes all controversy on this head. (Matt. xxii. 32.) If he truly infers that Abraham survives death, because he who is the God not of the dead but of the living, declares that he is the God of Abraham, it follows in the same way, that the genuine children of Abraham, even before they are born, are the heirs of eternal life, since the promise of God places them in the same position.

Let the readers therefore remember, that we are not here disputing whether it is necessary to baptize Infants, nor calling in question whether by Baptism they are ingrafted into the body of Christ, nor whether it is to them a laver of regeneration, nor whether it seals the pardon of their sins. The only question is the absolute necessity of Baptism. Let them remember the argument by which I maintain that they may obtain salvation without Baptism, viz., because the promise which assigns life to them, while still in the womb, has sufficient efficacy in itself. Hence it is that Paul makes honourable mention of them as holy, (1 Cor. vii. 14,) intimating that they are separated from the common race of mankind by virtue of the Covenant.

I adduce another argument—that the salvation of the soul

is by no means to be tied down to external signs. For what will remain for the blood of Christ, if we include spiritual life in water? I add, moreover, that Infants are baptized because they are of the household of the Church. For Paedobaptism rests on this ground, that God recognises those who are presented to him by our ministry as already his own. Whence, too, he anciently called all who derived their origin from Israel his own. And justly; for the offspring was holy, as Paul teaches. (Rom. xi. 16.)

My censor, disguising all these things, makes his first assault on the ground that we are born to spiritual life, not of blood, nor of the will of man, nor of the flesh, but of God, because nothing but flesh comes from flesh, and because we are all born children of wrath; as if I did not hold that the whole race of Adam is naturally under curse, and that thus infants themselves, before they see the light, are held involved in liability to eternal death. But he errs in not distinguishing between a natural vice, and a remedy proceeding from another quarter. I am not now devising a new solution for the occasion, but only repeat what I published four years ago.

In my Commentary on the seventh chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, I speak thus,—"How can this doctrine, that the children of believers are holy, agree with that which he delivers elsewhere, viz., that all are by nature the children of wrath, and also with the statement of David, 'Behold, I was conceived in sin?' (Psalm li. 5.) I answer, that the propagation of sin and damnation in the seed of Adam is universal, and that therefore, under this curse, all to a man are included, whether they descend from believers or from the ungodly. For believers beget their children, not by the Spirit but the flesh. The natural condition of all, therefore, is in this alike, that they are obnoxious to sin and eternal death. But the special privilege which the Apostle attributes to the children of believers, flows from the Covenant, by the supervening of which the curse of nature is destroyed, and those who were by nature unholy are consecrated to God by grace."

These are the very words I there use.

My Institutes also contain a fuller explanation of the subject. I say—

"Seeing it is written that we are all by nature the children of wrath, and conceived in sin, to which damnation adheres, we must quit our nature before we can have access to the kingdom of God. And what can be clearer, than that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God? Let everything, therefore, that is ours be abolished, and then we shall see this inheritance."

I then infer that Children have need of Regeneration. But I maintain that this gift comes to them by promise, and that Baptism follows as a seal. In short, I uniformly inculcate that their exemption from guilt is a supernatural privilege. This explanation ought not to have been unknown to my Censor, as I took it from Augustine.

That John the Baptist was sanctified from the womb, ought, he says, to be classed among the other miracles then related. I agree, and I have not used that passage in the present cause. I elsewhere produce it against the Anabaptists, to whom I do not think he belongs, and yet, as inconsiderate men are wont, he rashly lays himself under some suspicion.

As if he had already disposed of two errors, by absurdly mentioning the name of Pelagius, and quoting from Paul that all are by nature the children of wrath, he comes to a third error which he thinks he has detected. What is this error? My saying that Baptism is profaned if it is bestowed on aliens. But were my censor dealing with an Anabaptist he would employ the same argument with me, viz., that Baptism is rightly conferred on children whom God has adopted into his covenant. What absurdity, then, does he find in a matter which is confessed? He maintains, forsooth, that we too were aliens and sinners of the Gentiles, but were baptized by the command of Christ, who ordered that not saints only, or the children of saints, but that all nations should be baptized.

Surely the worthy Father, accustomed, I suppose, to philosophize at ease under the shade of wine or brandy, wished to carry the same ease a little farther. He ought to have

considered in what sense I say that Baptism is profaned, if we admit aliens and those of the household to it without distinction. This it is easy to evince from the command of Christ which he quotes. Christ, he says, orders all to be baptized. Does he not mean that the gospel is previously to be preached? The order which he commands to the Apostles is to teach and baptize. Therefore, by the doctrine of the gospel, those who were formerly aliens are ingrafted into the Church. This Paul teaches, (Rom. xi. 20,) that when the Jews, who were natural branches of the holy root, were broken off, the Gentiles, as wild olive branches, were ingrafted in their stead. How so? By the gospel. Our censor, therefore, acts absurdly in cutting off one clause, nay, in dividing and rending things which Christ had joined.

Wherefore I briefly reply, that aliens are indeed called to Baptism by the voice of Christ, but are previously adopted into the family by the preaching of the gospel. Thus Abraham was of the household before he received the sign of circumcision. In regard to the young, as God comprehends them also under the covenant, they are no longer reputed aliens, but are heirs of grace, as we learn from Peter's discourse. What I formerly delivered on this subject is evinced by my Institutes, where I use these words:—

"Why does circumcision follow faith in the case of Abraham, and precede the use of understanding in the case of his son Isaac? Because it is right, that he who in adult age is received into the alliance of the covenant from which he had hitherto been an alien, shall previously make himself thoroughly acquainted with its conditions; but not so the infant begotten of him, seeing that, according to the form of the promise, the infant is included in the covenant by hereditary right even from its mother's womb. Or to state the thing more shortly and clearly: if the children of believers, without the help of understanding, are partakers of the covenant, there is no reason why they should be kept from the sign because they cannot swear to the stipulations of the covenant. But he who is an infidel, being descended of wicked parents, is regarded as an alien from the communion of the covenant until he is united to God by faith. Where-

fore it is not strange that there is no communication of the sign when the thing signified would be empty and fallacious."

My only reason for quoting this is, to make it manifest that the censor's confidence is owing to mere ignorance, as he has not understood my meaning.

This refutes another objection, viz., that Christ said, "They that are whole need not a physician." (Matt. ix. 12.) I admit it, and accordingly I shew that it is only by his grace that health is restored both to young and old. But what do those who would seek the cure in water only leave to Christ himself, what to his blood, what to the gospel, what to the working of the Spirit? The only dispute between the censor and me is, that by restoring little children to life, when sudden death deprives them of the means of baptism, I teach that the remedy is full and effectual in the promise which Christ ratified by his own blood, whereas he cuts off all hope of salvation, if it be not sought from the external element.

He asks whether Baptism is to be denied to a Jew or a Turk, if they request it. Here everybody sees under what gross hallucination he labours in assuming that those are aliens to whom he assigns faith. What he chooses to dream, I cannot tell; it is absurd to use this argument against me, who uniformly teach, that by faith all who were most alien are united into the family and body of Christ. And yet this is no reason why they should not also be united to the Church by a formal rite, as a more complete ratification of their ingrafting, the seal of confirmation being added.

As to the Children of Papists, the answer is easy. In taking it for granted that they are validly baptized, I agree with him; but he falsely imagines that I regard them as strangers, because they were neither begotten of a holy father nor born of a holy mother. They cease not to be the children of saints, though it be necessary to go farther back for their origin. God does not stop at the first degree, but diffuses the promise of life to a thousand generations. Thus Paul, when he infers that if the root is holy the branches are also holy, and teaches that the harvest is consecrated in the first fruits, does not inquire what kind of father each had, but recognises all as holy who had sprung from Abraham

and the other patriarchs. The censor asks whether the son of a wicked man cannot be made pious? and forthwith exclaims—no error can be grosser than this! I, without exclamation, calmly advise him henceforth not to put himself into such a fervour without any cause: for he absurdly raises a contest about a point as to which we are all agreed.

When I say that Baptism is profaned if it is bestowed on aliens, he thinks it just equivalent to saying that a sick man is not to be cured because he is sick. Though this simile might have some plausibility with the ignorant, it is easy to shew in a few words how inappropriate it is. By those of the household, I mean not those who are whole, so as not to need Christ, but those who, dead in themselves, seek life in him; as by aliens are to be understood not all who have been alienated from God by sin, but those whom he still keeps from his kingdom, so that our ministry does not extend to them. Now such are all those to whom Baptism is not destined by the command of Christ.

All the censor says here has its source in ignorance, from his not understanding that those who are unclean by nature, are holy by virtue of the covenant; those who are exiled from the kingdom of God because of sin, are made nigh by the right of adoption; those who are liable to eternal death, nay, utterly dead in Adam, obtain blessing from the words, "I will be the God of thy seed," (Gen. xvii. 7,) so that they are the heirs of heavenly life. In short, he never considers what distinction there is between the children of Christians and Turks. He also betrays gross ignorance of the nature and efficacy of Baptism. Had it ever occurred to him that Baptism is an appendage of the word, the very point for which he contends, he would have seen the consequence that none are fit for the sign, save those who have been sanctified by the word.

From the same source flows the delirious dream of making women administer Baptism in what he calls a case of necessity, while he superciliously pronounces those who hold this to be the unlawful usurpation of another's office to be totally wrong. It is not the grave censure of a literary man, but the rude license of a mechanic, thus haughtily to condemn

one who has not deserved ill of the Church. An unknown nameless printer thinks that Calvin is totally wrong. What weight should the authority of this giant unsupported by any arguments have? But as it is an old and common proverb, that "A common error has the force of law," this opinion rashly conceived under the darkness of the Papacy has so prevailed, that there are many from whose minds it can scarcely be eradicated. How frivolous and absurd it is, I will shew in a few words.

All admit that the right and office of baptizing is not ordinarily competent to a Woman; but they excuse it as necessary, if there is imminent danger of death. Whence have they this idea, but just because it pleases them so to believe? I am not unaware that the pretended necessity is wont to be inferred from the words of Christ—"Unless a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." (John iii. 5.) Led away in old time by a similar error, they gave the bread and cup of the Eucharist to Infants, because it is written, "Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." (John vi. 53.) But in the present day even the Papists, blind though they be, do not stumble at this stone. I know not how it happened that they placed the absolute necessity in baptism, though this is absurd, and that while they admit of some modification in the case of adults, they shew themselves inexorable only to Infants. They grant that a man of adult age may be saved without baptism, provided he has a wish for it. Why then should not the pious vows of parents exempt a new born Infant from punishment?

They wrest the words of Christ to a very different meaning from that intended. First, it is evident that the whole of that discourse is allegorical. But to omit this, whoever will examine the passage without prejudice, will easily perceive that there is no mention of Baptism in it. But the evil is that they rashly lay hold of the term *water*, and deluded by a preconceived opinion, exercise their judgment no further. To me water and Spirit signify the same thing as Spirit and fire. For, as in the latter place, the term *fire* is put by way of epithet, so in the former I think the Spirit

is called *water*, because he has the virtue and office of water. Others oppose *spirit* and *water* as subtle elements to *earth*. And some ancient writers interpret *water* as mortification of the flesh. Either of the two is certainly more tolerable than to tie the salvation of man to a symbol.

We are not here discussing the necessary observance of Baptism; for we are agreed that Infants ought to be baptized, and that the omission of the sign is not optional. But where parents would willingly present their son for baptism, the question is, whether if he is snatched away by death, his salvation is to be despaired of? Those who insist that all are undone who happen not to have been dipped in water, form too malignant an idea of the kingdom of Christ, under which they pretend that the grace of God is more restricted than it formerly was under the law. As it was not then lawful to circumcise before the eighth day, if any male infant died three days after his birth there was no harm, the covenant and promise sufficing for the right of adoption. Now, when there is no prescribed day for baptism, it is more than absurd to hold that he who shall not omit the sign from either contempt or negligence, is defrauded of a Divine blessing, which the Jews obtained under the law. In that case we must say, that Christ came not to fulfil but to abolish the promises, seeing that the promise which was previously able in itself to confer salvation, will not now be ratified without the help of a sign.

It is said that most ancient writers thought differently. But it is worth while to observe how far they wished their opinion to be deferred to. This Augustine clearly explains in a few words, (Ep. 28, ad Hieronym.,) "Against the opinion of Cyprian," says he, "who perhaps did not see what was to be seen, let every one think as he will. Only let him not think contrary to the most manifest belief of the Apostle, who says, that all are born under condemnation; let him not think contrary to the best founded practice of the Church, which, because of the danger of the soul, runs to baptism."

I verily admit that all die in Adam, and that Infants no less than adults need the redemption of Christ. Nor do I

disapprove of the received practice of the Church in running to baptism. Only I think Augustine mistaken when in fixing the danger, he cuts off the hope of life from Infants, whom the Lord declares to be his own, and to whom baptism would not be competent if they were not already called to the fellowship of the Church by the promise of God.

What then, some one will ask, is the cause for running? This I think sufficient, that the parent may see the salvation which the Lord has promised in his word sealed, and as it were engraven on the body of his child; that seeking the ablution of his child in Christ, he may confess himself liable to death with his whole seed, that he may not seem to neglect the badge which has been given to confirm faith,—in short, that the child may bear the ensign of Christians to the grave. But this opinion of danger, as it was of private invention, may be safely repudiated. Its opposition to the clear passages which I have quoted from Scripture ought to make it give way. But if any one chooses pertinaciously to defend the opinion of Augustine, let him remember that he must send to perdition all who from nonage have not been allowed to partake of the Lord's Supper. He classes both together, holding that those who have not partaken of the Lord's Supper, perish no less certainly than those who have not received baptism. (Lib. de Merit. et Remiss. Peccat. 1, c. 24. Ad Bonif. Ep. 106.)

Augustine, however, does not say that the Church was induced by this danger to give Women license to baptize: for he says that in extreme danger they were wont to hasten to Church to use the public service. Hence it follows, that by no use or custom of the Church was it received that any one should take the office upon himself in private. In another place, also, he says, that mothers ran to the Church to provide for the salvation of their children. He nowhere says that they administered the remedy by their own hand.

We may also conjecture from what he says, (Lib. ii. Cont. Ep. Parman. c. iii.,) that Baptism by Women was altogether unknown in that age. He says, "If a layman, compelled by necessity, shall have given baptism, I know not if any one can piously say that it is to be repeated. If it is done with-

out any necessity compelling, it is the usurpation of another's office: if there is urgent necessity, it is no fault, or a venial one." He certainly ought rather to have raised the question with regard to women, had any such example then existed. As he doubts with regard to men only, everybody must see that women never occurred to him, as the thing was altogether unheard of. He still remains undecided as to men, and dares not wholly excuse them of venial sin.

But all doubt is clearly removed by a decree of the Council of Carthage, in which, without exception, Women are prohibited from administering Baptism. Let the printer, therefore, no longer say that I am totally in error, while he sees my foot so well planted in a sure place. Tertullian says, "It is not permitted to a woman to speak in the Church, nor to dip, nor offer, lest she should claim for herself any function of the man, not to say of the priest." The passage, indeed, as it is read is faulty, but no man of moderate learning will doubt what Tertullian's opinion was. Nor ought we to omit what is found in Epiphanius, who, in his first book, Contra Haereses, upbraids Marcion with giving women license to baptize, and counts it among the absurd mockeries of which he says his sect was full. And, in the second book, speaking of the Phrygians and Priscillians, he ridicules their madness in making bishops of women, whereas in Christ there is neither male nor female.

I am not ignorant of what my censor will say, viz., that there is a great difference between common use and an extraordinary remedy adopted under the most urgent necessity. But as no necessity is excepted by Epiphanius, when he calls it mockery to permit Women to baptize, I think I may infer that this corruption is condemned by him as not excusable under any pretext. In the third book, when he says that the thing was not even permitted to the holy mother of Christ, and adds no restriction, who sees not that baptism by women is absolutely disapproved by him? In short, it is the height of impudence here to pretend the support of antiquity, when it plainly appears that this abuse was not established without a barbarous confusion throughout Christendom.

On the other hand, the example of Zipporah is quoted, in

which some pleasing themselves more than they ought, betray their own want of discernment, (ἀβλεψία.) First, even on their own shewing, the cases of Circumcision and of Baptism are different: for they do not say that that ancient symbol was absolutely necessary. Secondly, I think it is erroneously inferred, from the fact of the angel being appeased, that the act of Zipporah was approved by God. Were it so, we must say that he was pleased with the worship perfunctorily paid to him by the inhabitants of Samaria, who had been transported thither from Assyria. (2 Kings xvii.) Thirdly, it was a special act, and cannot properly be drawn into a precedent.

It may be added, that we nowhere read that special authority was given to priests to Circumcise. The words of Christ are clear, "Go and teach all nations, and baptize them." He certainly appointed them both preachers of the gospel and ministers of Baptism. If, as the Apostle testifies, no man duly takes honour upon himself in the Church, unless he who is called, as was Aaron, I hold that whosoever baptizes without a lawful call, rashly intrudes into another's office. What! while the Son of God was unwilling to intrude himself, shall any son of earth, without any authority, appoint himself the public dispenser of this great ordinance? Even in the minutest matters, as meat and drink, whatever we attempt and dare with a doubtful conscience, Paul plainly denounces as sin. Now, in the Baptism of Women, what certainty can there be while a rule delivered by Christ is violated? For that office of the gospel which he assigns to ministers, women seize to themselves.

Let my censor tell me whether it be lawful for men to put asunder what the Lord joins. I shew that two things were conjoined by Christ—the preaching of the gospel and the administration of baptism. Let the mouth of Women then be opened contrary to the distinct prohibition of the Spirit, if we would permit them to do another thing which is a sequence from it. But I cannot sufficiently express my wonder, that those who produce this passage are so dull as not to perceive, that nothing was less intended by Zipporah than to perform a divine service. Scornful and indignant

she throws the foreskin on the ground, and in reproaching her husband even charges God with cruelty. I am not unacquainted with the fables of the Jews on this passage. The thing however is clear. A woman burning with rage upbraids both God and her husband with forcing her to shed the blood of her son.

In short, not to dwell longer on this, I will briefly shew that it betrays a want of common sense to seek a precedent in the act of Zipporah. In the presence of her husband she circumcises her son. And who was that husband? Moses the chief prophet of God, than whom no greater ever arose in Israel! Let the Woman-baptists tell me, whether they will permit a woman to baptize in presence of a bishop? Such a monstrosity would certainly horrify them, nor do I think that the brow of the printer is so thoroughly bronzed that he is not now ashamed of his stupid censure.

Meanwhile, I beseech sober readers that they will bring to the perusal of my writings a modesty corresponding to the veneration which I feel in handling the oracles of God. Conscience is my witness, that with all reverence and humility, as in the sight of God and angels, I deliver to others what has been given me by the Spirit of Christ, and do not so much follow what pleases myself, as bring my mind into obedience to God. That I am far from being of the number of those whom ambition tempts to court novelty of doctrine, my whole course of life testifies. And in my writings, methinks, there is no ostentation, but manifestly throughout a simple desire of edifying.

ON SHUNNING

THE UNLAWFUL RITES OF THE UNGODLY,

AND PRESERVING

THE PURITY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

A LETTER BY JOHN CALVIN,

TO HIS DEAR AND VERY EXCELLENT FRIEND,

N. S.

A.D. MDXXXVII.

ON SHUNNING

THE UNLAWFUL RITES OF THE UNGODLY,

AND PRESERVING

THE PURITY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

My dear Brother,

I feel extremely sorry on your account, and, as in duty bound, pity your situation, in not being able to come forth out of that Egypt in which so many Idols and so much monstrous Idolatry are daily presented to your eyes. While pious ears shudder at the very mention of these things, how much more grievously must they offend the eye whose perceptions are at once more vivid and more keen? You are forced, as you mention, to behold foul forms of impiety in monks and priestlings, a thousand kinds of superstition in the common people, numerous mockeries of True Religion. In all quarters around you these teem and resound. As I count those happy who can spare their eyes such spectacles, so your condition, as you describe it, I regard as truly miserable.

First of all, The Mass, that head of all abominations, forces itself upon your view, and takes the lead among all those species of iniquity. In it every imaginable kind of gross profanity is perpetrated. Were such spectacles exhibited in derision, you might perhaps be able to laugh at them; but now, when they are performed in earnest, with the greatest contumely to God, I doubt not, from your well-known piety, that, instead of exciting mirth, they arouse your indignation, or rather call forth your tears.

You ask me to advise you by what means you may be able, while compelled by the times and the circumstances of your situation, to live amidst this horrible sacrilege and Babylonish pollution, to maintain your fidelity to the Lord pure and unpolluted? This advice I very willingly give, and will now proceed to open my mind to you on the whole subject. This I am the more induced to do from perceiving that, while many in the present day, who seem to have received some serious impressions, are far from acting up to what they profess, almost all, in this matter especially, are seen to deviate from the right path. Nor is it very difficult to give the proper advice, if you will give yourself wholly up to the discipline of the Lord, and allow all your feelings to be brought into subjection to his word. But it happens, I know not how, that great numbers among us, with wicked presumption, rebel against his commands, and, despising them or neglecting them, (a thing equivalent to contempt,) arrogate to ourselves, whenever it suits us, license to do things which they most strictly forbid. This is particularly the case in regard to the present matter.

When those who live in the difficult position which you now occupy perceive that they can neither maintain their tranquillity, nor live on harmonious terms with their neighbours, unless they make a pretence of indulging in Idolatry—amid the difficulties which thus beset and perplex them, they attend more to what may be expedient for themselves than pleasing to God—more to what may gain human favour than secure Divine approbation. Meanwhile they devise a defence by which they may keep their consciences at ease in the view of the Divine tribunal, pretending that they are far from giving an internal heartfelt assent to any kind of impiety, but only have recourse to a little harmless pretence as a necessary concession to the ignorant, and also as the most promising means of gaining over persons whom it were foolish to irritate by a course which could not lead to any beneficial result, and would be attended with the greatest danger.

By such beginnings they commence their own ruin! How often, within our own memory, have persons, by thus veering

round, been driven back and wrecked on the very rocks from which they had made their escape? At first, when the danger of making a candid profession of their real sentiments was fully in their view, they thought it was but a small matter to do a little folly for the gratification of the people, and at the same time escape from giving grievous offence. They accordingly took part promiscuously with others in the performance of Impious Ceremonies. Finding that even this failed to secure them against suspicion, they advanced another step, holding it sufficient if good men were made acquainted with their faith, and alleging that the erroneous opinion which others might entertain of them did no harm. Hence, when the enemies of Christ talked babblingly against sound doctrine, they expressed assent by look and nod and gesture, and at length by voice also. Perceiving that even this device had not the success which they anticipated, they began to be contented with a secret conviction, which they imparted to no man, studiously guarding against doing anything which might give the slightest indication of Christian feeling. In this way, after deviating from the straight line of duty gradually, and, as they thought, in the exercise of a moderate caution, they have at last become so blind and forgetful of themselves, as to plunge headlong into destruction. A manifest proof, undoubtedly, of the righteous judgment of God! Justly have they been given up to the vanity of their own mind, while, by a preposterous prudence, they imagined that they were deceiving God and man. For the last act in the part they thus played, was not only not to allow any eye or ear to be witness of their real conviction, as they had formerly allowed, but to do all that in them lay to make all men witnesses of things in their conduct from which every Christian man should most anxiously abstain, and publicly display a dislike and abhorrence of that which they secretly approved. The result ought to warn us how necessary it is to lay aside our own schemes, and walk carefully as in the sight of the Lord, as the Prophet expresses it, (Mic. vi. 8,) lest by giving way to presumptuous feelings we shake ourselves free from those laws under which he has laid us, and loose that which he binds. Those thus wise in

their own conceit ought to have been afraid to think how "He taketh the wise in their own craftiness, and overturneth the counsels of the prudent." (Job v. 12; 1 Cor. iii. 19.)

To this it is owing that, at the outset, I lamented, on better grounds than I could wish, that herein a great part of mankind see nothing clearly, judge nothing rightly, resolve nothing soundly, but, seeing the dangers which threaten a pure and thorough observance of the Divine law, look round in fear and perplexity to devise some means by which, without incurring the displeasure of God, they may be able to retain the favour of men. In this devising they consult only their own anxiety and blind perturbation, and in consequence act at once perversely and absurdly: for that which the voice of God has once sanctioned and decreed cannot, without impiety, be made a subject of doubtful discussion; and no good result can reasonably be expected by him who makes timidity and pusillanimity his counsellors—counsellors justly regarded as the base parents of base children. The decision is such as might be anticipated. Turning their eyes aside from the Word of God, they exact nothing more of themselves than can be performed without endangering either their safety or their circumstances. Everything attended with peril or serious difficulty they easily allow themselves to set aside; meanwhile turning a deaf ear to the fearful threatenings denounced against those who contemn the protection offered by God, and seek to better their condition by abandoning their post. When the Jews, distrusting the present aid in which they had been ordered to confide, had recourse to the forbidden aid of Egypt, the Lord, by his Prophet, thus upbraided them, "Woe, abandoned children, that take counsel, but not of me; that weave a web, but not by my Spirit; that begirt yourselves to go down into Egypt, and have not asked at my lips, hoping for assistance in the might of Pharaoh, and putting confidence in the shadow of Egypt: The might of Pharaoh will be your confusion, and confidence in the shadow of Egypt your disgrace." (Isaiah xxx. 1-3.)

Seeing he inveighs so bitterly against them, can anything milder or more indulgent be expected by those who, dis-

pleased and indignant that Providence has exposed them to hatred and all kinds of danger, endeavour to shake themselves free of them, by having recourse to new and unlawful precautions of their own devising? I am not unaware that the subterfuges which seem to remove danger are much more agreeable to our effeminate carnal nature than simple obedience to the word of God, when beset with dangers. But there is no difficulty too great to be surmounted by him who strengthens himself with the consideration that, though all men should threaten, their menaces cannot outweigh those which the Lord denounces against the deserters of his camp in the prophecy which I have quoted. No small assistance should be given to us by the example of Cyprian, of whom Augustine, in a certain passage, relates as follows: —After he was condemned, his life was offered him on condition that he would, in word merely, abjure the religion which was his only crime; and not only so, but when he was actually at the place of execution, the governor of the province distinctly called upon him to deliberate whether he would not rather save his life (for so the Emperor's clemency allowed him to do) than sacrifice it as the penalty of a foolish obstinacy. His brief answer was, that in so sacred a matter there was no room for deliberation.

If any one wonders that the holy man, when all the apparatus of torture was in his view—the executioner with his grim, cruel features, the sword hanging over his neck, the taunts and imprecations of a furious blood-thirsty populace sounding in his ears—was not dismayed at all these terrors, but cheerfully gave himself up to death like a victim devoted to the altar, he does well to wonder; but let him at the same time consider, that what sustained his magnanimity unimpaired to the last, was the thought deeply fixed in his mind, that God had called him to such a confession of his piety. This thought made him proof against all the terrors which otherwise might have made him waver. Hence he uttered a sentiment which ought to make his name immortal, and pursued a course deserving not more of praise than of imitation.

Thus indeed it is. Whenever any semblance of good or

convenience would withdraw us one hair's-breadth from obedience to our heavenly Father, the first thought which ought to present itself for our consideration is, that everything, be it what it may, which has once obtained the sanction of a Divine command, thereby becomes so sacred as not only to be beyond dispute, but also beyond deliberation. Merely by allowing ourselves to deliberate in such circumstances, we overstep our proper limits; and this being done, we are on a downward path which quickly leads us farther astray.

This much, by way of obviating our common timidity, I thought it necessary to premise before proceeding to give you a direct answer, because I see that here our minds are much more impeded by the dimness of vision which this timidity produces, than by any kind of ignorance. Perhaps I have dwelt on it at greater length than the circumstances required, but certainly not at greater length than the practices of the present times demand. Numerous are the persons in the present day who, if not urged on to suffer even unto blood by stern rebuke, turn a deaf ear to every mode of teaching.

The vice of our age, and indeed the common vice of all ages, is yielding to the allurements of the flesh, which are so enticing and crafty, and clothe their delusions with such specious names, that the first step of true wisdom is to discard and banish them altogether from our counsels. I am not so diffident of your own disposition as to have used such a lengthened preamble had I been speaking to yourself alone. Having experienced your calm and meek docility on many different occasions, I would have deemed it amply sufficient to make a simple reference to such topics; but while I purpose to satisfy your own particular request, as the subject is of general interest, and many are perilously in error in regard to it, I thought it would not be in vain, nor without some fruit, were I at the same time to adapt myself to the circumstances of the many who labour under the same mistake, so that all into whose hands this letter may fall, (and I not only permit, but earnestly desire that it may be communicated to as many as possible,) they may consider it as

written to them also. Thus, if they will listen, they will be admonished of the path to which duty points; and if they will not listen, they shall at least receive a testimony convicting them of having knowingly and even wittingly rushed on their own destruction!

First of all, it behoves us to have our eyes intently fixed on that which Christ holds forth to all his disciples when he first initiates them into the discipline of His school. For when he taught them to begin with denying themselves and taking up his cross, he at the same time added, "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him will the Son of man be ashamed when he shall come in his own glory and his Father's, and that of the holy angels." (Luke ix. 26.) Let us remember then, that this is the edict which our Saviour issues when we are first enrolled in his family, and that the perpetual edict promulgated for life to those who would belong to his kingdom is, that if they have embraced his doctrine with true heartfelt piety, they must manifest this piety by outward profession. And, indeed, how dishonest were it to be unwilling to make a confession before men of him by whom they wish themselves to be acknowledged before angels? and how would they have the truth of God to remain effectual to them in heaven after they have denied it upon earth?

There is no room, therefore, for any one to indulge in crafty dissimulation, or to flatter himself with a false idea of piety, pretending that he cherishes it in his heart, though he completely overturns it by his outward behaviour. Genuine piety begets genuine confession. Nor should the words of Paul be deemed vain: "As with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, so with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." (Rom. x. 10.) In short, the Lord calls his followers to confession, and those who decline it must seek another master, since he cannot tolerate dissimulation.

Here some one may ask, Must a few believers, living scattered among an impious and superstitious multitude, in order duly to testify their faith, continue in season and out of season, in public and in private, vociferating against the impiety of their countrymen? Must they go out into the

streets to preach the truth of God? Must they mount pulpits and call meetings? Not at all. Nay rather, seeing the Lord calls to the ministry of his word Apostles or Prophets, or messengers, or whatever other name he chooses to give to those whose voices he is pleased to employ in public, it is not necessary that all men should everywhere attempt to do the same; it is not expedient, nay, it were even unbecoming. Therefore, the thing required rather is, that each consider for himself what befits his own vocation and order. Thereafter, by pursuing a correspondent conduct, each will best discharge his duty. On those whom the Lord destines for the ministry of his word he bestows a kind of public character, that their voice may be heard in the light, and rise trumpet-tongued above the house tops! Others abstaining from the public office of Apostles must prove themselves Christians by performing the duties of private life.

As this cannot be conveniently explained with so much brevity, let us proceed to explain its nature at greater length. That part, however, which we have specially confined to a particular class of individuals, I mean the function of public profession, we shall omit for the present. Perhaps we shall have a better opportunity of speaking of it elsewhere. We shall only inquire concerning that which pertains alike to every individual among the people, and consider, *first*, What kind of confession the Lord requires of his followers who live few and scattered among the wicked, in a place from which the discipline of true Religion has been exiled? and, *secondly*, What are the marks in the outward conduct of life by which he would have them to differ from the crowd of idolaters with whom they are intermingled? But it is not my intention precisely to determine when, with whom, in what place, and to what extent a Christian man is to give visible evidence of his faith, or to point out the limits—how far he ought to proceed, or when he may be able to halt without offence, whenever an occasion of advancing the glory of God, or a hope of doing good in any way is presented. A discussion of this nature would be almost endless, and is besides somewhat at variance with the present mode of discussion, which cannot be shut up and confined within fixed rules. It is not

easy to prescribe limits either to that ready mind which Peter requires of us, when he wishes us to "be ready to give an answer to every one who asketh us to speak of the hope which is in us," (1 Pet. iii. 15,) or to that ardent zeal of celebrating the glory of God and the splendour of his kingdom, in which the Prophets introduce the people of God as exulting, when they put such language as the following into their mouths: "Come let us go up into the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us his ways, and we shall walk in his paths." (Isaiah ii. 3; Micah iv. 2.) By these words it is obvious that a clamant exhortation is given us to desire the knowledge of God. Then, who sees not the wide extent of Paul's injunction, to "follow the things which make for edification?" (Rom. xiv. 19.)

Those, therefore, who are imbued with true piety towards God, ought not to wait for any more certain law than that of displaying his holy Majesty, to which it behoves them to be wholly consecrated and devoted by every convenient and lawful means in their power; nor to set any other end or limit to this display than that of embracing all conjunctures, and so to speak, continually laying hold of every moment, so long as they are confident that anything can be accomplished. One, indeed, may be able to act more excellently, more bravely, more perseveringly than another; but all, individually, must contend according to the grace given unto them. But, as we have said, this is not the place for expatiating on so wide a subject. Our intention is not to take up the general question—How far does duty bind you to seek the glory of God and the edification of mankind? but only to shew, in general, the precautions which you are to employ while living among the ungodly, and which you cannot omit without defiling yourself with their profanity and sacrilege.

Since everything which the Scriptures contain on this subject appears to have been specially delivered for the sake of those who were living among nations ignorant of God; and it is commonly thought that there is a wide difference between the idolatry of such nations and the superstition of those with whom we have now to do, (the latter using the

name of God and Christ as a kind of cloak, while the former, from a grosser ignorance, openly despised the worship of a Supreme Being,) we will, *first*, bring forward the Precepts contained in the Scriptures; and, *secondly*, view them with reference to our own times, endeavouring to ascertain how far from similarity of circumstances they are applicable to us. I see not, indeed, why we should confine the eternal commands of God to any particular age, but we adopt this arrangement as a concession to the unskilful, that no kind of scruple may preoccupy their minds.

When the Lord, by his Law, forbade Idols to be reverenced or worshipped, he, under that head, comprehended the whole of the external worship which the ungodly are wont to bestow upon their Idols. (Exod. xx. 4-6.) Such is the natural force of the terms which he employed—the one, meaning to bow down; the other, to bestow honour: and it is evident that the species of adoration struck at, is that by which Images of wood or stone are worshipped by bodily gestures. The Lord, therefore, by his interdict, does not simply prohibit his people from standing in stupid amazement like the Gentiles before wood or stone, but forbids any imitation of their profane stolidity in any form, by prostrating themselves before Images for the purpose of paying honour to them, or giving any other indication of religious reverence, such as we are accustomed to give by uncovering the head or bending the knee. Accordingly, when he describes his pure worshippers, the mark by which he distinguishes them is this—"I have preserved to myself seven thousand men." (1 Kings xix. 18.) What! is it those whose hearts are not infatuated by the vanity and lies of Baal? Not only so, but those also "whose knees have never been bent to Baal, and whose lips have never kissed his hand." In another place he employs the same symbol, when declaring that his majesty must be acknowledged by "all things in heaven and on earth, and under the earth." He thus describes the mode of acknowledgment: "Every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall swear by my name." (Isaiah xlv. 23.) Here it is obviously implied, that an Image receives the worship due to God when reverence for it is expressed by any bodily gesture.

To establish the guilt of those who express such reverence, it is of no consequence under what pretence, or with what sincerity they do it. Whoever bestows any kind of veneration on an Idol, be the persuasion of his own mind what it may, acknowledges it to be God, and he who gives the name of divinity to an Idol withholds it from God. Accordingly, the three companions of Daniel have taught us what estimate to form of this dissimulation. (Dan. iii.) To them it seemed easier to allow their bodies to be cruelly consumed by the flames of a fiery furnace than to please the king's eye, by bending their thighs for a little before his statue! Let us either deride their infatuation in inflaming the anger of a mighty king against them, to the danger of their lives, and for a thing of no moment, or let us learn by their example, that to perform any act of idolatry, in order to gain the favour of man, is more to be shunned than death in its most fearful form. Wherefore, when they had only two alternatives between which to choose—either to shake off the fear of God and obey an impious edict, or to despise men when brought into competition with God, they wished it to be notified to the king that they would not worship his gods nor bow down to the statue which he had set up. The equal constancy of Daniel, in a very similar case, is mentioned by the writer, whoever he was, who added the appendix to his prophecy. He says that Daniel chose rather to be torn to pieces by the claws of lions, than bend the knee in worship of the dragon which others worshipped as God. But as this history is not received by all, I refrain from quoting it as an authority.

Moreover, lest any one might suppose that he had done all that was required of him by merely withholding his head or his knee from the worship of Idols, the Lord has added numerous precepts concerning the holy keeping of his ceremonies, and utterly shunning the ways of the Gentiles. In the Prophet, (Isaiah lii. 11,) he by a single expression declared how completely clear he would have his people to be from all communion with impiety, when he prohibited the Jews who had been transported to Babylon from even touching what was unclean. This clause, as Paul interprets sum-

marily, implies that they were not to pollute themselves by any observance or ceremony unbecoming the sanctity of their religion. For, giving injunctions to the Church of Corinth on that subject, he was contented to borrow a summary of his whole sentiments on the subject from this one passage. (2 Cor. vi. 17.)

It is a fact, believe me, not to be idly or giddily overlooked, that those only duly preserve the holy Religion of God who profane it by no defilements of unhallowed superstitions, and that those violate, pollute, and lacerate it, who mix it up with impure and impious rites. Believers who duly meditate on this consideration, will carefully give heed not to involve themselves in such sacrilege. In this way, Abraham, Isaac, and the other Patriarchs, though they sojourned in countries which teemed with the abominations of Idols—although they mourned over the infatuations of their hosts, which as they could not cure, they bore with, took anxious care, however, to keep themselves within the pure and untainted worship of God. And though they did not publicly proclaim their dissent from the superstitions practised around them, they gave no indication of a pretended compliance.

Of this simplicity a distinguished specimen appears in Daniel. (Dan. vi. 10.) Although he was living in Babylon amid the pollutions of Idolatry, yet being as far from holding communion with it as if he had been placed at an immense distance away from it, he contracted no stain. Seeing, however, that there would be no place for true piety in presence of the people, he withdrew from their sight, and shutting the doors of his chamber, worshipped his God apart with becoming purity. Thus, notwithstanding the public error of the city and nation, he deviated not from the right faith. To the same effect is the injunction laid upon the Jews in the law, that they should not covet gold or silver from the graven Images of the nations and bring it into their houses, but should regard it as an impure unclean thing which was an abomination in the sight of the Lord. He taught them to detest and abominate everything which had once borne the name of Idol, that thus they might the more zealously shun the impure superstitions of the Gentiles.

But if it was the will of God, that under the Old Testament his Religion, though still obscure and only shadowed forth by figures, should be observed with so much external purity of profession, how much more necessary must this be in the Christian Church to which he himself, by the appearance of his only begotten Son, has unlocked the mysteries of his wisdom, as it were completely encircling it with the light of His Truth? This may be easily confirmed by the doctrine of the Apostles. The argument which Paul uses against fornication, holding equally true with regard to this matter, may without absurdity be accommodated to it. "Know ye not," he says, (1 Cor. vi.,) "that your bodies are the members of Christ? Shall I then take the members of Christ and make them the members of a harlot? Far from it!" In the same way, may we too argue; seeing our members are the members of Christ, shall we defile them by the worship of Idols, or by impure Superstitions? What were this but either to subject the glory of Christ to ignominy, or dissever our body from the body of Christ to commit fornication with Idols? The precept with which he concludes has a general application to all kinds of modification: "Let us remember that our body is the temple of the Holy Spirit; that we are not our own, but have been bought with a great price, and ought therefore to bear and glorify God in our body." Will the glory of God be displayed in our body after it has been rolled in the mire of Sacrilege? Will the sacred sanctity of the temple of God be preserved if it be polluted by alien and profane rites?

If on any subject Paul is an urgent exhorter to duty, his urgency is more particularly displayed when he admonishes Christians not to exhibit anything unworthy of their profession before the eyes of men by using vicious ceremonies. Referring to two great evils, the dishonour of God and the offence of men, the natural consequence of all simulate compliance with Idolatry, or of other imitations of it on whatever ground undertaken, he at great length warns us against committing either. In regard to the profanation of the Divine Name and honour, his words are, "Dearly beloved, flee the worship of Idols." (That under the term *worship* he

comprehended all external rites which are used by the ungodly, is manifest from the subsequent context,) "I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say. The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the body of Christ? Therefore we many are one bread, and one body; for we all partake of one bread." (1 Cor. x. 14-17.) "You see Israel according to the flesh. Are not those who eat the Sacrifices partakers of the altar? What then? Do I say that what is sacrificed to idols is any thing? or that an idol is any thing? But that which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to demons and not to God. Now I would not have you to be partakers of demons. You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons: you cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of demons." (1 Cor. x. 18-21.)

At first he calls to their remembrance how intimate their fellowship is with the Lord Jesus Christ, in being made partakers of his body and blood, that the more closely they are united to him, the more they should withdraw from all participation with Idols. Outward Sacraments are a kind of bonds by which they are united to the Lord, and hence also the converse holds true, viz., that those who mix themselves up with impure ceremonies, thereby ingraft and entwine themselves in fellowship with Idols. Next, he deprives them of all handle for quibbling when he anticipates the objection which they might take—that an Idol is nothing, and therefore the flesh offered to Idols differs in no respect from common flesh. This he concedes in so far as the mere substance of the flesh is concerned; but he rejoins, that men are of a different opinion, and that in our acts which are submitted to their inspection, their judgment must be regarded. He adds, that those who eat flesh offered to Idols give support to the error of the weak, leading them to infer that in that way men offer Sacrifice to Idols; and thus in the sight of men God is dishonoured. He afterwards gives utterance to a still stronger expression, viz., that there is such a contrariety between the table of Christ and the table of demons, that to taste of the one implies a renunciation of the other.

Ultimately he concludes his exhortation thus—"Do we challenge God? Are we stronger than he?" (1 Cor. x. 22.) Such is the force of this appeal, that he could not have more bitterly (I had almost said tragically) assailed any criminal act than he has assailed that fictitious Superstition, which many in our days regard as the most trivial of faults. In another passage, (2 Cor. vi. 14-16,) he says, "Be unwilling to be yoked with unbelievers. For what fellowship hath righteousness with iniquity? or what part hath a believer with an unbeliever? or what fellowship hath light with darkness? what concord hath Christ with Belial? what agreement hath the temple of God with Idols? For you are the temple of God, as he says, (Lev. xxvi. 12,) I will dwell in them and walk among them, and I will be their God and they will be my people." He does not wish Christians to be so averse to all connection with unbelievers as to have no civil contracts nor dealings; in short, no intercourse with them. Were it so, he says, it would be necessary to quit the world altogether, (1 Cor. v. 10;) but he does not permit them to form any alliance which may ensnare believers into an imitation of their Superstitions. He afterwards subjoins the testimony of Isaiah. (Isaiah lii. 11.) "Therefore come out from among them, and be ye separated, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing." Thus he enjoins us not to keep at a remote distance from unbelievers in respect of space, but to stand far aloof from their polluted rites.

The subsequent context, in which Paul, borrowing either the words of the Prophet or using his own, declares that "the Lord will thereupon receive us, and become a Father to us, and acknowledge us as his sons and daughters," (2 Cor. vi. 18,) ought to make a deep impression upon us, as suggesting that if, in contradiction to the precept, we do not utterly abstain from the handling of things unclean, we deserve to be cast off and repudiated by him. In many passages, particularly in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, he treats at length of offence to our neighbour. What he says is to the following effect:—"In regard to the meats which are sacrificed to Idols, we know that an idol is nothing, and that there is no God but one: for although many, whether in

heaven or on earth, are called gods, to us there is one God the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him: but there is not knowledge in all." (1 Cor. viii. 4-6.) Here, by anticipation, he takes up the objection of those who quibblingly pretend innocence of conscience, and, driving them from their subterfuges, recalls them to the view which men take of their conduct; reminding them that, by making men the witnesses of their conduct, they invite them, by their example, to do the same things; and they do them, not because they understand them to be lawful, but because they see an authority in the individual whom they imitate, though he is acting not only with a doubtful, but with an opposing conscience.

And see how completely he cuts off all handles for tergiversation by the following rejoinder:—The sitting down at the sacred Feasts of Idols had some semblance and form of Idolatry. Nevertheless, some believers sat down under the pretext that they were eating the pure and holy creatures of God, which creatures, though they had been consecrated to Idols a thousand times, could not be contaminated by such sacrilegious consecration, since an Idol is nothing but a vain figment of the unlearned! The Apostle, to refute the futile pretext, sharply rebukes them for that crafty prudence which, disregarding and neglecting brethren, makes them wise only to themselves. "Knowledge," he says, "puffeth up, but charity edifieth. If any one think he knoweth something, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know." (1 Cor. viii. 2, 3.) He admits that an image is indeed nothing, but he rejoins that the worship of Images is something, and into the practice of it the idle were led by their authority. He says, "There is not knowledge in all; for some, with a consciousness of the Idol, eat it as a thing consecrated to Idols, and their conscience, being weak, is defiled. When any one sees him who has knowledge sitting at the Idol's Feast, will not his conscience, seeing he is doubtful, be encouraged to eat? and by your consciousness shall your weak brother perish, for whom Christ died? In this way sinning against the brethren, and wounding their weak consciences, you sin against Christ." (1 Cor. viii. 7-12.)

It is just as if he had said, When you deem all the persuasions of the Gentiles as to their gods to be vain and frivolous fictions, (as they really are,) you are wise only for yourselves: what you openly do, as it may seem to be a participation in the worship of false gods, you do to the peril of many: for the rude and simple who are present at the spectacle, having not yet reached that prudence of yours, which understands that Idols are nothing, on seeing you apparently communicating in their religious rites, what other idea can they form than just that you are worshippers of Idols, and thus be emboldened to commit the sin which their own conscience condemns? Wherefore, I care nothing for that pretended prudence of yours. As it ensnares the brethren, and affords cause for error, so it is unworthy of Christian men. Nay, the impiety which is committed by the wicked in imitating you, seeing it is committed by your fault, must be charged to your account.

Now, then, it is sufficiently clear, that though all Christians are not equally obliged to perform the public office of professing Religion, there is, however, a kind of private confession which all, without exception, are bound to make, though its precise limits cannot possibly be defined. All are not endued with the same grace to make it, and its nature depends a good deal on opportunities which do not occur alike to all. It certainly, however, goes this length—that we are not to say or do anything unworthy of a genuine faith, or inconsistent with the integrity of our Religion. Examples of such confession may be conjectured, partly from the writings of the Apostles and partly from early Christian history, to have been illustriously given in pure primitive and well-managed Churches. For although we read not, that the believers of that age declaimed on their Religion in the streets and public highways, nay, read that they concealed their Christianity from those to whom it would have been perilous to divulge it, we at the same time read that they were most studiously careful not to give any indication adverse to their Religion, or to pretend that they were anything else than Christians.

And indeed, in what light the Lord views those who keep

their faith within, devoid of all confession, may be inferred from the terms in which they are described by the Evangelist. (John xii. 42, 43.) "Many of the rulers," he says, "believed on him, but did not confess him because of the Pharisees, lest they should be cast out of the synagogues: for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." Oh, fatal thirst of praise! If the glory which we expect with God is to be commenced with insult from men, what must become of those who are more desirous to be approved of men than of God? And if the sentence of the Lord has pronounced that those who would save their life in this world, would lose it for eternity, (Matt. x.; Luke ix.; Jer. xiv.,) how much more strongly does this apply to fame, the loss of which is more easily borne than that of life? Moreover, if he has declared that he wished to be sanctified in those to whom he promises that he will be a Sanctifier, what hope of themselves can those presume to have who set so little value on his sanctification as to refuse to purchase it by some slight diminution of their reputation?

In regard to this confession, so far as it belongs to the present subject, let it be understood as beyond all controversy, having been clearly established by unequivocal passages of Scripture, that this confession is violated and overthrown not only by the abjuration of the lips, but also by all outward semblance of impious Superstitions and every kind of profanation of true Religion. Wherefore it behoves every man who possesses a pure zeal for piety, not only to refrain his tongue from impious words, but keep every part of his body untainted by any sacrilegious rite.

But since very many, as we have above mentioned, while admitting that Christian piety is dissipated and overthrown by any intermixture with Idol abominations, yet think that we are not bound to abstain from the rites of the Papists, (rites indeed sacrilegious and profane, but performed as they say in the name of God, not in that of Idols!) we must here refute this error, and as we promised, shew by a comparison of the present times with those in which the passages we have quoted from Scripture were written, that they anathematize Papistical Ceremonies not less than any other kind

of Idol abominations. The alleged distinction between them we shall afterwards consider. This only let us now regard as established, that there never was displayed in Gentile Superstitions sacrilege more execrable, more grievously subversive of true piety, or more insulting to it than some of those things that are now everywhere seen within the domain of the Pope. Should the Lord one day enable a complete purification to be made in the Churches, which that priest of delusions has corrupted by his impostures, the only method by which it will be accomplished will be by plucking up by the roots, and as it were by one stroke of the pen erasing everything which has proceeded from his hand! It is indeed true, that some things are of such a nature that you may tolerate them for a time, and even engage in the observance of them without sin. But even here there is need of prudence and great precaution in distinguishing those things which are of this form and stamp, from those which are openly at war with the word of God, and bear the mark of impiety, as it were, vividly impressed on their forehead. The whole of this will be better and more briefly explained by placing it before the eye in the form of examples.

To interdict the Eating of Flesh under the name of Religion, and bind the consciences of believers by such an interdict, was plainly tyrannical, and as the Apostle expresses it, (1 Tim. iv. 1-3,) "devilish." And seeing the Lord had left it optional to eat flesh daily, or abstain for a lifetime from eating it, nothing forbids you to abstain on particular days. For why may not that be occasionally lawful which is at all times free? Thus you may without sin obey an iniquitous command, provided your intention be to make a concession to the ignorance of the weak, and not also to enthral your mind by those fetters of tradition. To prohibit them from Marrying who are not constitutionally permitted to decline marriage, is tyranny of the same description: and you have not the same liberty to submit to it, unless the gift or abstinence have been specially bestowed upon you.

In regard to the Ceremonies practised by your countrymen, and which have given occasion to the present Letter,

the rule which I would propose for your observance, while you continue to live there, is that those of them which are not stamped with impiety you may observe, soberly indeed and sparingly, but when occasion requires freely and without anxiety, so as to make it manifest that you have no Superstition either in observing or refraining from them. Those which bear the smallest impress of sacrilege, you are no more to touch than you would the venom of a serpent; for I have no doubt of being able to prove to you that no serpent's venom is more pestilential! Under this latter head I include the Worship of Images, the receiving of Extreme Unction, the Purchase of Indulgences, the Sprinkling of Water, over which those impious exorcisms have been chanted; and several other rites in themselves damnable. For what can possibly be alleged in their favour to save them from the condemnation which we thus pronounce upon them?

I am aware that there are certain middle men to whom we seem too harsh, in attacking what they would have to be thought light trifles of no moment! But what do they allege in opposition to our excessive severity; for so they are pleased to call it? Certainly they will not venture to deny that wherever Images are set up in Temples to be worshipped, the great body, or rather the whole multitude, pay them Divine honours; and by so doing break the Second Commandment, which forbids the Worship of Idols. I say not merely the stolid vulgar, but the most wary, and those possessed of the highest endowments of talent and learning, are caught and entangled in this error. It is to the opinion of those thus entertained that I call your attention, as you remember the Apostle desires us to do. If in order to make them believe that you do not differ from them in Religion, you uncover the head or bend the knee before an Image, what is this but to give a distinct testimony, declaring that you are an idolater? But the pretence is, that you pay honour to the Image in deference to man, while in your heart you confine worship to God only. As if it belonged to you to make yourself a divider of honour between an Image and the living God; or as if you could elude His all-

seeing eye, and hide from it a thing which the eyes of all men perceive!

What else can I say in regard to Chrism and Unction? If you maintain that you sin not in receiving it, because to satisfy the unjust desires of men, you merely allow your body to be anointed while your conscience is not at all affected; I, on the contrary, maintain that you sin grievously in holding forth your forehead to get it inscribed with the blasphemy used in their Confirmation, viz., that you are confirmed with the Chrism of Salvation; or stretch forth your hands to have it engraven upon them, as is done in making their priests, that the power of Sacrificing has been conferred upon you: or give all the parts of your body to be besmeared with no less execration in what they call Extreme Unction, telling you that your sins are remitted by oil! This I shall concede to you to be a trivial fault, or no fault at all, if I do not get yourself to confess that it is indecent in the extreme that bodies destined for the incorruption of the kingdom of heaven should thus be defiled by foul blasphemies, to be carried into the presence of the Lord on that day when they shall stand before his Tribunal to receive the immortal crown of glory.

Then, any one who throws his pence into the coffer where Pardons are set out for sale, or purchases anything for himself out of that prolific and abundant treasury of Indulgences and Dispensations, enrols his name as a sharer in those nefarious traffickings, and declares his consent to them as clearly as if he wore their badge! I cannot admit the excuse which is commonly made, that just as wild beasts are calmed by throwing offal to them, so the rage of Priestlings is to be softened by throwing them a few coins, or occasionally bestowing upon them a large sum of money, seeing that where lucre is in question, they gape over their prey and are more ravenous than a hungry lion; always, like the false prophets and false priests of old, (as the Prophet testifies, Micah iii.,) sounding the tocsin of war against every man who will not put something into their mouths! This excuse, I say, I cannot accept. For what do those Bulls, the favour of which you make a pretence of desiring, imply? Do they not with

loud voice proclaim that in return for the money you leave, you carry off Indulgences full of anathema, and deserving of the utmost execration? Have not those who understand this, (and everybody understands!) and who see you offer money, (did you not wish to be seen you would not do it!) an abundantly clear testimony that you are desirous to have a share in Indulgences? If you thoroughly examine what is concealed under them, you will nowhere find Christ and his cross more systematically insulted.

And, finally, in regard to that Water, consecrated by devilish Exorcisms, how can those whose forehead it besprinkles venture, unless they have nothing more than a forehead, to contend that they may use it with impunity? For what do they mean by such sprinkling? Is it that they are cleaning their face in public with a little drop of filthy water? Do they thus sport wantonly, without cause, in presence of a distinguished assemblage? It is neither of these, nor anything like them. By that symbol they bear witness to the assembled multitude, that they do not hold the sanctity of Exorcism in contempt. By this, unquestionably, they set their seal to all the blasphemies which are vented by Exorcisms, viz., that a virtue has been infused with the Water which expels demons, cures diseases, drives off ghosts, and dissipates all kinds of harm. Lest they complain that I misrepresent their acts, and that they have none of the impiety which I impute to them, I appeal to their own consciences, and ask whether, when they submit to such rites, they mean to persuade the people of anything less than that for which I have censured them? The people themselves, whose wishes they desire to satisfy, I now bring in as judges; and there is not one of them who will not declare that this is the idea which they all have. If they say it is unjust to be tried by such a rule, let them bring their charge of harshness against the Apostle, and expostulate with him, not with me.

I see that I shall never have done speaking, nor objectors have done quibbling, unless we agree as to some ascertained matter, in which that which we wish to teach may be seen plainly, and with the utmost evidence. Let us therefore

take one example from the Mass; and if everything which the Scriptures deliver on the subject of Idolatry, or which may be said to prove that all those ceremonies which I so strongly maintain that you ought to shun, are not to be used as things indifferent, is not equally applicable to the Mass, I give up the cause! My reason for selecting it from all other abuses is, because the reverence in which it is held is so extreme, that though you might be able to escape animadversion in regard to them, you cannot easily absent yourself from it without bringing many eyes upon you. Hence it is that many persons are to be met with who see the mischief of other observances, and abstain from them, while they admit that, notwithstanding the abominations with which the Mass teems, you meet with very few who venture to absent themselves, whether blinded by terror, they do not see the truth, or err from despondency and lukewarmness, rather than want of discernment.

It is for this reason, I think, that the whole of the present discussion is in a manner comprehended under this one article, so that this hallucination by which men are chiefly dazzled being disposed of, all other articles in which the delusion is not so strong will readily be conceded to me.

All, I mean all persons like yourself, who have learned to hear and obey the word of God, I here, as was premised, undertake to teach along with you. Let us consider, then, for a little, what is implied when, in order not to seem to hold the majesty of the venerable Mass in contempt and derision, you present yourself during its performance, and are seen standing like a worshipper among other worshippers. First of all, though there are none imbued with any tolerable knowledge of God, who do not know what the Mass itself is, yet, that they may thoroughly and honestly hold what they do know, I must put them in remembrance. A great many, I see, err from this, that though at home they have a clear and distinct idea of its nature, yet, when they approach it, they forget how fearful the tragedy is of which they are about to be spectators. But not to be obliged to begin a long and oft repeated discussion, I must refer my readers to my INSTITUTES for an exposition of the different kinds of Sacrilege

in the Mass. There, I believe, that so far as the brevity of the work would allow, I have explained the whole subject, and also everything which specially relates to the matter now in hand. I only say, that every believer should be aware that the mere name of Sacrifice (as the priests of the Mass understand it) both utterly abolishes the cross of Christ, and overturns his sacred Supper which he consecrated as a memorial of his death. For both, as we know, is the death of Christ utterly despoiled of its glory, unless it is held to be the one only and eternal Sacrifice; and if any other Sacrifice still remains, the Supper of Christ falls at once, and is completely torn up by the roots, its only use being as a token, and as it were a seal of that one oblation. Were these two things, which are so constantly annexed to the Mass, that they cannot possibly be dissevered from it, the only ones by which I endeavoured to render all Communion in the Mass detestable to you, what could you do but unite with me in expressing a common detestation? What! are you, to whom it is not lawful to glory in anything but the cross of Christ —when you see conspirators met to extinguish its glory, to cut down and overturn its testimony—are you to league yourself along with them? Did we view the matter with an unjaundiced eye, must we not see that those who take any kind of share in the Mass do nothing else than hold up their hand in approval of such conspiracy?

There is a third point, however, which, the more clearly it is explained, the more seriously it ought to impress pious minds, viz., the abominable Idolatry, when Bread is pretended to assume Divinity, and raised aloft as God, and worshipped by all present! The thing is so atrocious and insulting, that without being seen it can scarcely be believed; but it stands so exposed to the eyes of all, that there is very little need of argument. A little bit of Bread, I say, is displayed, adored, and invoked. In short, it is believed to be God, a thing which even the Gentiles never believed of any of their statues! And let no one here object that it is not the Bread that is adored, but Christ, who becomes substituted for the Bread the moment it has been legitimately consecrated.

Were we to grant that this applies to the Holy Supper of Christ—though there is nothing we are less disposed to grant—yet it has no application to the Mass, any more than to the ancient Supper of the *Pontifices*, or the banquet of the Salii! If we are agreed, as we certainly ought to be, that the Lord gives His Body, in the mystical Supper, not to be adored, but to be eaten; and that the presence is not natural, which must be confined to a particular spot, but spiritual, which no interval of space, no distance, can impede; or, if you prefer it, that He there exhibits, not the nature of His Body as present and circumscribed, but his efficacy and virtue, not even would this doubt remain as to the Supper itself. But as all do not yet see the thing in this light, lest any one allege that I am taking a doubtful and controverted matter for one certain and confessed, I will not insist upon it. Let Christ, then, be present in the Supper in a true and natural Body; let him be handled with the hands, crushed with the teeth, swallowed by the gullet, and let him, moreover, place his Divinity there, such as when it dwelt in an ineffable manner in his flesh, how right and lawful is it to adore it? (the absurdity of doing so has been elsewhere fully demonstrated by us;) but though both were granted, what has this to do with the little bit of Bread, apart from Christ's Supper? For if the Lord gives His Body, under the bread, to be eaten by his faithful followers, while piously cultivating the memory of his death, it does not follow, as a matter of course, that he gives himself to be sacrificed and slain by impure Priestlings, as often as they please, unless we think there is such virtue in their putrid oil, that it gives ability to all whose hands are anointed with it to become formers of Christ's body; or unless we believe that the will of the Priestling has the weight of a heavenly decree, so that whenever he determines to bring Christ down out of heaven, he makes Him instantly present by his nod; or, unless we imagine a kind of magical power in the words of Christ, which only when articulately muttered unfold their efficacy. By such absurdities they try to persuade us that they bring Christ out of the Bread!

Whatever they stolidly prate with regard to their power

and intention of consecrating, let us discard from our view. We know, *first*, that the promise which they falsely allege is specially appropriated to the Supper; and, *secondly*, that it was given to the faith of the pious, not to the derision of the ungodly. But if it has no place without the Supper, what place, pray, will it have in the Mass, than which there is nothing more opposed to the Supper? And if it has been held forth to none but the pious, to nourish and confirm the faith of those who believe themselves eternally sanctified by the one oblation, which Christ offered to his Father on the cross, how can it be performed to those who do not understand its nature, and wickedly make it a pretext for mocking his truth? It is plain, therefore, that the god whom the gesticulating Priest keeps exhibiting whenever he turns round his altar, is not brought down from heaven, but is of the kind extracted from a cook-shop!

There cannot now be a doubt that the promise which gives the body of Christ to believers, under the symbol of Bread, no more belongs to them than it does to the lower animals, nor refers to Masses any more than to Bacchanalia or Turkish feasts. What! does the sacred name of Christ seem slightly insulted by those histrionic gesticulations, so utterly indecorous and indecent that sane and sober men should never make them? To mere fools only could such absurdities be tolerable, but that the name of the Lord should be inscribed on them is at once grossly insulting to his sanctity, and to be borne only with the utmost indignation; or, to speak more truly, is not on any account to be borne at all, especially when we see that the direct tendency of the whole is to bury, subvert, and utterly extinguish the divinely instituted Ordinance of the Holy Supper.

Come now and consider with me, in regard to a pretended observance of the Mass, with what kind of conscience you can be present at the performance of its mysteries. Immediately on your entrance, the altar offers itself to your view, differing little from a common table, but proclaiming, by its very name, that it is to be used for sacrificing! This itself assuredly is not free from blasphemy. You see the Priest coming forward, who boasts that, by the anointing of four

fingers, he has been appointed mediator between God and man, who, carrying off from the faithful of the Church, and from the Supper itself, that promise in which Christ gives his Body and Blood to his servants, to be eaten under the symbols of Bread and Wine, arrogates it to himself and his fellow slayers, who dishonour his heavenly Supper by giving it the name of Mass, in which it is completely inverted and deformed. The people stand by, persuaded that every one of these things is Divine ; you stand among them pretending to be similarly affected. When the impostor has gone up to the altar, he begins the play with acts partly motionary, partly stationary, and with those magical mutterings by which he thinks himself, or, at least, would have others to think—he is to call Christ down from heaven, by which he devotes Him when called down to Sacrifice, and by which he procures the reconciliation of God with the human race, as if he had been substituted in the place of a dead Christ ! These acts you see received by the whole multitude, with the same veneration as those above-mentioned ; you shape your features to imitate them, when they ought visibly to have expressed the utmost abhorrence !

Will it still be denied to me that he who listens to the Mass with a semblance of Religion, every time these acts are perpetrated, professes before men to be a partner in sacrilege, whatever his mind may inwardly declare to God ? At last, behold the Idol (puny, indeed, in bodily appearance, and white in colour, but by far the foulest and most pestiferous of all Idols !) lifted up to affect the minds of the beholders with Superstition. While all prostrate themselves in stupid amazement, you, turning toward the Idol with an expression of veneration, prostrate yourself also. What effrontery must ours be, if we deny that any one of the things delivered in Scripture against Idolatry is applicable to the Idolatry here detected and proved ! What ! is this Idol in any respect different from that which the Second Commandment of the Law forbids us to worship ? But if it is not, why should the worship of it be regarded as less a sin than the worship of the Statue at Babylon ? And yet the three Israelites, to whom we above referred, shuddered more

at the idea of offering such worship than of suffering death in its most excruciating form. If the Lord declares the impurity of the vulgar superstitions of the Gentiles to be such that they are not to be touched, how can it be lawful to keep rolling about in such a sink of pollution and sacrilege as here manifestly exists? Taking the single expression which gives the essence of all the invectives which the Apostle had uttered against Idolatry—that we could not at once be partakers at the table of Christ and the table of demons—who can deny its applicability to the Mass? Its altar is erected by overthrowing the Table of Christ, and its feast is prepared by plundering, lacerating, defiling the meats prepared for the Table of Christ. In the Mass Christ is traduced, his death is mocked, an execrable idol is substituted for God—shall we hesitate, then, to call it the table of demons? Or shall we not rather, in order justly to designate its monstrous impiety, try, if possible, to devise some new term still more expressive of detestation? Indeed, I exceedingly wonder how men, not utterly blind, can hesitate for a moment to apply the name "*Table of Demons*" to the Mass, seeing they plainly behold in the erection and the arrangement of it the tricks, engines, and troops of devils all combined.

But here new subterfuges are resorted to. For some of those who, when they were involved in the common labyrinth of error, were anointed with the oil of the Papal Priesthood, are still wallowing in the old sty; and though they have been admirably instructed by the goodness of God in the one eternal Priesthood of Christ, still proceed to sacrifice and ask that they may be permitted to do so with impunity. Truly a shameless request! They are to be allowed to preside at the Mass, though I have long been maintaining on the strongest grounds that Christian men ought not even to be present at it! The quibbles by which they try to get off it may be worth while in passing to hear and refute.

Their language is to this effect: Since neither the sacrilegious idea of Sacrificing Christ, nor the absurd opinion of the change of Bread into God, nor any of those Superstitions which make the Mass impious, have any place in our minds, the external rites by the exhibition of which we are

compelled to satisfy the unjust demands of men, be they what they may, are of no great consequence, as they cannot prevent us from celebrating the Holy Supper of the Lord instead of the Mass: it were perverse rigidity to estimate the Mass merely by the external mask of ceremonies and its trifling absurdities, and not by the vicious opinions and sacrilegious falsehoods in which we all acknowledge that its impiety consists. Therefore, making no mention of offering, and removing all vain Superstitions, if there is no doubt that we keep the Lord's Supper in the only way in which the unjust manners of the age permit us to do, it is absurd and unbecoming to inveigh against some frivolous trifling Ceremonies, as if they were great crimes!

But suppose I were to accost some one of these persons thus—the Lord's Supper is accompanied with its own Ceremonies, which are by no means to be neglected, because they were ordained by a heavenly Master, and so ordained that they are the appropriate and genuine symbols of the Supper, and are so essential to it that if they are taken away the Supper itself can no longer be recognised. Tell me, then, by what authority you presume to give the name of Supper to a deformed thing stript of all the symbols of the Supper, and more resembling a play than a divine ordinance? I deny that there is any Lord's Supper, if all believers who are present have not a common invitation to its sacred feast, if the sacred symbols of the Bread and the Cup are not set before the Church, and the promises as a seal of which it has been given are not explained, and the gift of life purchased for us by Jesus Christ is not preached. Will you shew me one *iota* of these in the Mass? Are not all things in it, on the contrary, adverse and repugnant? Will you then honour, with the name of God, absurdities devised by the stolid presumption of man, or transfer the name of Supper to circular movements in which not a trace of it appears? In short, will you represent the Supper under the image of a diabolical Mass? Will you persuade us that in an act in which you ignominiously travesty the death of the Lord, you observe his Supper, in which he distinctly exhorts us to shew forth his death? What you tacitly mutter with

yourself is heard by no one. When you distinctly declare by the action of your body that you are performing a Sacrifice, is this to shew forth the Lord's death? If he left room for Sacrifice after it, then his death was vain! And why do I not, as I easily may, at once cut off all handle for such quibbling? They know that the people, whom they admit as spectators of the play, have assembled for the celebration of a Sacrifice: whether or not they really perform a sacrifice is nothing to the point: they certainly make an exhibition which they wish to be regarded as a Sacrifice. They see the people prepared for the flagrant adoration of an Idol: they themselves get it up in a conspicuous place to be worshipped, as if they could at the same instant stretch out their hands to the living God and lift up an Idol, before whom an idolatrous people were to prostrate themselves and commit fornication! I do not here say that which, if I were to say it, I know not if they would be able to refute—that there cannot be a single particle of piety in those whose hands are able to perform the gestures of so flagitious an act, whose strength and nerves do not fail in the very attempt, whose limbs do not shake and totter with horror! But this only will I say, and they will not be able to gainsay it, that that alleged way of approaching to the Lord's Supper, is as wide away from it as is the difference between him who zealously and strenuously heralds forth the Divine glory, and him who acts as leader and president and inaugurator in the perpetration of sacrilege! At the same time, I call upon others, who, when charged with attending the Mass, are accustomed to answer that it matters not to them what a Priestling mutters apart by himself—that they regard it only as a symbol which enables them to be as it were present at the Holy Supper of the Lord, and be engaged with the commemoration of his death. I call upon such persons, I say, rather to make no excuse at all than this wretched one!

And I hope they will not make it; if they will duly consider with themselves how absurd it is in many ways to make a memorial of the death of Christ in the Mass, which brings no remembrance of it to the minds of men, but one

which had better be forgotten, viz., the obliteration and suppression of its whole efficacy, together with the deepest affront to Christ himself, and to say that they can almost find a substitute for the Supper in a ceremonial in which they are so far from shewing forth the Lord's death, that they almost abjure it. For in so far as regards the Mass, wherever they turn their eyes, what do they behold which can furnish them with a memorial of that sanctification, righteousness, and redemption, obtained by the one sacrifice of Christ—a sacrifice which teaches and shews that Christ is the only Priest, and has neither partner nor successor—a sacrifice which testifies that by his death all things pertaining to our salvation were accomplished? With what right then can the Mass be regarded as a commemoration of that to which it bears not the slightest resemblance? Moreover, when they say that they derive almost the same benefit from it as from the Supper, they bear a strong testimony against themselves—a testimony proving that in the observance of it there is nothing they are less intent upon than giving a confession that may redound to the glory of Christ, though to this believers are expressly called in the Supper.

With regard to the specious distinction which they commonly attempt to draw between the present Idolatry and that of ancient times, though I think all good men must now be satisfied that it has no real foundation, let us consider what its nature is, since we have undertaken to do so, and it seems expedient to subdue the obstinacy of certain individuals. The account they give of the matter is as follows: The reason why the Lord anciently uttered such fearful denunciations against those of his servants who should in any way take part in the Superstitions of the Gentiles was, because the honour given to Idols being manifestly given to false gods, transferred the honour of divinity to them, and took it from the true God. The world, indeed, is no less infatuated with abominable superstition in the present day, and given to indulge in stupid and almost fatuous ceremonies; but there is this difference,—those Ceremonies, of whatever description they may be, still are performed in the name of God, as a part of His worship, and therefore any person

who observes them, while free from perverse superstition, derogates nothing from the true Religion of God. Were they here speaking of those intermediate rites to which, for the sake of distinction, we lately gave the name of "indifferent," I would not vehemently oppose the permission of them: but when they include those ceremonies also which are marked by manifest impiety and intolerable insult to God, we will shew by a few examples drawn from Scripture how unskilfully they argue.

The Brazen Serpent, after it ceased to be used for the particular purpose for which it had been set up, (Num. xxi.,) had been left to be an eternal memorial to all ages of the Divine mercy. But when, under a pretended imitation of their forefathers, posterity began to pay it Divine honours, who can doubt that the original ground of religious observance was still much the pretext, and that it was commonly given out and became the received opinion, that it was an Image of the Supreme Being, and was to be worshipped to His glory! Now, did history relate that any of those whom the Lord did not suffer to fall under such blindness while wholly free from Superstition, yet, in accommodation to the general infatuation, bent the knee before the Idol, who would not at once detest the wicked deception? Assuredly, it would have deserved the common indignation of all pious minds. But, unless we are too much disposed to flatter ourselves, the iniquity of bending the knee before a little bit of Bread is not less flagrant than was that of bending it before the Serpent! What! when Aaron made a Calf and shewed it to the people, and said in derision, "These are thy gods, O Israel, that brought you out of Egypt!" (Exod. xxxii. 4,) this was not his true meaning. They denied not that God was their Redeemer and the Author of their lately acquired liberty, but they wished to see Him in the Calf, because they did not feel assured of his actual presence when they did not see him with the bodily eye. Accordingly, when a solemn feast to God was proclaimed by Aaron they made no opposition, but paid the glory which they meant to give to the living God, in presence of a calf as a kind of visible representative, (*ceu spectro ejus quodam.*) Put two cases, and

suppose if you will that there was no Superstition in either, will they venture to say that in thus falling down reverently before the golden Calf, they did anything better or more tolerable than if they had done it before an Egyptian cow?

Jeroboam also made his Calves. (1 Kings xii.) If we ask why? he had no real intention to adopt new gods, nor any thought of openly revolting from the true God. So far from despising the true Religion, he did not even disapprove of the sacred Ceremonies which he was endeavouring to vitiate. It was distrust alone that drove the man headlong in his mad course. For agitated, as the Holy Scripture relates, by an anxious fear lest the minds of the people, affected by the Temple worship and its holy Majesty, might turn again to the house of David from which they had revolted, he resolved to devise new Rites which, withdrawing their view from the Temple, might gradually alienate them from the kingdom of Judea. Accordingly, on bringing forward his Calves, he did not advise the people to choose them and revolt from the true God. This would have sounded too harshly to their ears. He only told them that they were in them to worship their ancient and wonted God. The purport of his harangue was this:—It is intolerably burdensome for you to go up to Jerusalem: O Israel, these are thy gods who brought thee out of the land of Egypt. His object was to persuade them not that he had exterminated the former and was introducing some new Deity, but merely that he was furnishing them with a means by which, with less annoyance, they might adore Him whose might had formerly delivered them from the miserable bondage of Egypt.

The true nature of the worship of the Calves, however it might cloak itself with the name of the eternal God, is abundantly attested by the prophets. Though there should have been no superstition, though the idea of worshipping a calf should have been utterly abhorrent from their thoughts, no man could be held guiltless who went up to sacrifice at Bethel, which the word of God called Bethaven. But if such persons were impious, we, forsooth, shall be righteous who profess to take for God a morsel of bread, as soon as the intention of an impious priestling shall have devoted it to immolation!

Again, it was altogether unlawful to imitate the religion of the Samaritans, because it was mixed up with the worship of strange gods, and polluted by a depraved and illegitimate worship of the true God. Our mistake, dear brother, lies here—thinking no ceremonies to be in themselves impure and sacrilegious but those which are publicly stamped with the names of heathen gods, we forget how extremely sacrilegious it is to profane the holy Name of God. But it is not more profaned when, by the substitution of other gods, he is distinctly rejected, than when any fiction dishonouring to his majesty is affixed to it. Away, then, with those who, on the view of a missal-god of wafer, bend their knees in hypocritical adoration, and allege that they sin the less because they worship an idol under the name of God! As if the Lord were not doubly mocked by that nefarious use of his Name, when, in a manner abandoning Him, men run to an idol, and he himself is represented as passing into bread, because enchanted by a kind of dull and magical murmur!

When I thus distinctly interdict all fellowship with impious Superstitions, I do not wish you to understand me as if I were laying a religious obligation on you in regard to things which it may not be in your power altogether to avoid, or which ought to be left free. Nor, although innumerable instances of impiety are daily exhibited within the walls of all the churches there, do I therefore debar you from ever entering their thresholds; nor, though all their images have been dedicated to nefarious sacrilege, do I therefore forbid you ever to turn your eyes upon them. The one of these is free from fault; the other, besides not being injurious in itself, ceases to be in your own power the moment you step out of doors, so completely are all places filled with idols. I would not, therefore, have you to be so superstitious as to imagine that your foot is more polluted by entering a temple, or your eye more polluted by looking at an image, than it would be by entering any place of ordinary resort, or looking at an unpolished shapeless stone!

But while you hear that such things are permitted you, be carefully on your guard not to allow liberty to degenerate into licentiousness. I think I correctly define the proper

limit when I say, that you are utterly to abstain from all fellowship with any form of sacrilege, meaning by fellowship not mere proximity of place, (which cannot be considered as connection,) but inward consent, and some kind of outward manifestation indicative of consent. There is scarcely any reason to fear that those on whom the light of truth has shone in any degree at all will internally cleave to them. It is by attestations of wicked participation that they ensnare themselves, and understand not that as to the real point it makes no difference whether they do it from superstition or crafty pretence; seeing that in both modes alike they hold the holy Religion of God in derision among men, and by their example partly confirm the ignorant in obstinacy and perverseness, and partly unhinge the dubious, wavering consciences of the weak.

When the Apostle forbids us to have any fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, (Eph. v. 11,) he at the same time adds, that we are rather to reprove them. This latter clause explains what he meant by the former, namely, that we always have fellowship with flagitious and iniquitous acts whenever we indicate in any way that we are pleased with them. From this you perceive truly and without doubt, that from the defiling effect of the abominations of which we now speak, he alone keeps himself free who does not even allow himself any fictitious imitation of them, but is abstinent to such a degree, that he contracts no guilt or stain either by look, access, or vicinity; approving his constancy to the Lord all the more, because, while encompassed by the troops of the enemy, he does not allow himself to be forced. In this way Paul was able, (Acts xvii.,) without injury to his piety, not only to walk round all the Athenian altars, and tread over places which exhibited the traces of a thousand impieties, and still perhaps smelt of recent sacrifices, but he could turn his eyes on this side and that, and minutely examine the inscriptions on every altar. He did not reverently bend himself at the name of each deity, nor practise the formalities which idolaters observed in saluting their images, but disregarding all superstitions, he continued seeking, what he at length finds, a means of illustrating the

glory of God, by borrowing, as it were, a page out of the books of his opponents.

In the same way there was no danger lest on embarking in the ship which bore the sign of Gemini, he would commit any offence, in consequence of that dedication, while he conducted himself so as to make it manifest that he had no fellowship with any superstitious rite. For we cannot suppose him to have done what it is probable the others did according to custom—either saluted the tutelar deities on first entering the port, or on quitting it asked of them a favourable voyage, or chimed in with those who asked, as if he were concurring in their prayer. In order that the vain dedications of the Gentiles might not throw any obstacle in our way, as if they could prevent us from making a pure use of those things which the Lord has sanctified for use, (provided always we abuse them not,) Luke has expressly stated that Paul was not deterred by these signs of Castor and Pollux from taking his passage in a ship dedicated to them; but he has not mentioned that as to which no one could have any doubt—that, as became a Christian man, he took good care to keep at the farthest possible distance from every species of idolatry.

Though I feel confident, from your known reverence for the truth of God, that a view confirmed by so many passages of Scripture has received your full approbation; yet, as I have been writing not for yourself alone, I beg you will allow me to take the state of others into account. I am not surprised that in this matter there is a considerable difficulty in obtaining their submission to the truth, because it must no doubt be unpleasant and disagreeable to them to be awakened out of that state of placid indulgence in which they have long slept. Methinks I now see some of them deriding my frivolous and unseasonable moroseness in thus pressing a matter of no great weight, as if religion entirely hinged upon it. I remember how some with whom I formerly had some conversation on the matter, when they felt too strongly pressed to be able to defend their cause by direct argument, betook themselves to such commonplace as the following:—

The state of the times must be considered—we were too much occupied with remedying more important and truly serious injuries to have leisure or feel much anxiety for the removal of paltry faults and minute trifling matters: our first care must be to unite men's minds and imbue them with piety, to train their manners, and bring them into accordance with the rule of piety; in short, make their whole life bear the impress of charity, meekness, patience, and the other gifts of the Spirit—when this was accomplished it would be sufficient time to descend to these lighter matters. Now-a-days some men are so perverse that they make the very essence of our Religion consist in a mere abomination of the Mass and other Ceremonies, tolerating anything in a Christian man sooner than the hearing of a Mass, and extolling and heralding as worthy of the Christian name any man, however destitute in his general conduct of one grain of piety, who only shews himself to be a hearty hater of the Mass.

What answer I then made to such objections the persons to whom I refer must bear me witness; but seeing there will be some, as I have said, who will now interpret us in a similar way, I hope I shall be able to make them understand how little such a style of defence can avail them. I exhort them, therefore, first to lay aside all love of contention, and then consider with themselves whether that ought to be deemed a light and venial fault, by which Paul declares that the Lord is defied, sin is committed against Christ, the table of devils is partaken of, and the table of Christ is repudiated. If these are light offences, entitled to an easy pardon, where shall words be found weighty enough to describe flagrant delicts and crimes?

If they say that Paul's censures are wrested from their proper aim, I see not what other aim can be given them. These bitter terms were directed against those who sat down at the festivals of idols to eat of the victims which had been sacrificed to them. They called God to witness that they did it with a pure conscience, since, contemning the vanity of the Gentiles, they did nought but eat the pure creatures of God, which they knew to be sanctified for the use of the

faithful by prayer and thanksgiving. Paul rejoined, that that assemblage of unbelievers had met for the worship of an image; that it was a solemn feast appointed in the name and for the sake of the idol; he, therefore, who sat as a celebrator of the meeting and the feast, whatever his own mind might be, did an act by which the glory of God was exposed to the derision of idolaters, and the consciences of weak brethren were unhinged, because they supposed they had, and gloried in having a Christian man as an associate in the worship of an image, and were emboldened by his example to do the same, although with a wavering and undecided conscience.

What do our objectors do? They assemble at Mass, which they see provided with a long and varied apparatus of sacrilege, and they assemble with a multitude known to entertain a pernicious veneration for the Mass. So little do they inwardly pity this blindness and superstition, that they outwardly imitate it. The bread, which they know to be an idol to the others, they concur with them in venerating, by using the same gestures. Do they not, by so acting, hold forth the cross of Christ to the ridicule of his enemies, and by their example tempt the hesitating conscience of weak brethren to imitate it? There is no ground, therefore, for speaking in flattering terms of their prevarication, against which they see the Apostle thus fulminating. Are they not aware that the professed and sworn enemies of Christ and his gospel exact this from them as a pledge of their having abjured true piety? In order to ascertain the faith of each individual in the present day, the Lydian stone which they employ is to observe carefully who attends the Mass and who not. In the single observance of the Mass, they receive a kind of tacit profession by which allegiance is understood to be sworn to all their abominations; and by the mere contempt of the Mass, they understand that all else falls and is abjured. Now, then, let those favourers of Masses, with whom I am dealing, candidly say whether, when they make this concession to the deadly enemies of the word of God—a concession which they are aware is regarded as a symbol of abjurance of the true religion—they do not, by giving

this pledge, bind and enslave themselves to their execrable religion? For I hold that we must not merely consider what attendance at the Mass is when viewed by itself, but what weight is to be given to it when taken in connection with its circumstances. My opinion is, that this weight is exactly proportioned to the concession which they mean to make to the unjust demands of the ungodly.

Let our example be Eleazer, mentioned in the History of the Maccabees, and the woman with her seven sons, there also mentioned. (Joseph. de Machab.; 2 Macc. vi. 7.) When all might have ransomed their lives by tasting a little bit of swine's flesh, they chose rather to submit to excruciating tortures than apply their tongues to taste it. If you look at the thing merely in itself, you will almost be disposed to think that it was madness thus to rush upon death for such a cause; but if you carefully ponder it, you will find a most important reason why they should sooner submit to the most cruel tortures than contaminate themselves by tasting forbidden food. I admit that the obligation to abstain from eating swine's flesh was not stronger than that of abstaining from eating the shewbread, which David, however, when pressed by hunger, ate without sin. But when an impious tyrant, who wished not only the law of God abolished, but his very name extinguished, urged them to testify by this sign that they abjured the observance of the Mosaic Law, they considered, and justly considered, that if they complied, they would not merely violate the Law in an insignificant ceremonial, but give evidence of having denied God and abjured his whole Law. Hence, when the friends of this holy man managed to substitute and set before him other flesh for that of swine, that he might eat it, he would not tolerate the dissimulation, because he saw that thus he would still give the same pledge of blasphemy to his enemies. To dissemble, he said, is not befitting my time of life; many young men will thus be led to suppose that Eleazer, in his ninetieth year, has gone over and embraced the life of strangers, and be deceived through my dissimulation, to secure a short space of a corruptible life; thus shall I bring dishonour and execration on my old age: and though

I should for the time escape the punishments of men, neither living nor dead shall I escape the hand of the Almighty: wherefore, by boldly departing out of life, I will do what is befitting my age! I will perchance leave an example to young men, if, in defence of the most weighty and most sacred laws, I submit to an honourable death firmly and with ready mind.

Here behold, I will not say a most apposite example, but an exact image which shews us to the life what it is to hear Mass, as a means of appeasing the enemies of Evangelical Truth. Moreover, however much they may be disposed to regard it as one of the minutest of sins, still, if they admit it to be a sin and a transgression of the Divine will, which it cannot be denied to be, they ought not to estimate it so lightly as to make it almost allowable. For although, in comparing Divine precepts among themselves, one is seen to outweigh another, yet, apart from that comparison, no interest of our own ought to weigh with us so far as not at once to yield to the least of them. For thus our Divine Master himself teaches: "Whoso shall break one of these least commandments, and teach men so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of God." (Matt. v. 19.) We see that these words are specially directed against that class of teachers who draw distinctions between the laws of God, representing some as of a lighter nature, and therefore to be violated with more indulgence. When they hear that the kingdom of heaven will not enrol in its numbers a single individual who has rendered the very least of the Divine precepts contemptible by the facility of violating it, how can they venture to continue repeating, that at present no mention should be made of a delinquency which is almost universal?

One of the worst things connected with human judgment is, *first*, to decide on whatever is enjoined according to its own opinion, not according to the will of God; and, *secondly*, to look merely at the precept itself, without considering (though it is of the greatest moment) that God is a Lawgiver, whose majesty is impaired by the minutest of what they choose to call paltry offences. But the Lord, to

meet this depravity, and teach that not one *iota* of his Law was to be disregarded, shews his Prophet in vision that a roll of malediction had gone out over the face of the whole earth, by which all theft and all perjury were alike condemned. (Zech. v. 3.) To the same effect also James says, (James ii. 11,) "He who said, Thou shalt not kill, said also, Thou shalt not commit adultery; Thou shalt not steal; Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods." Though a man may have observed the whole Law, still, if he offends in one point, he is guilty of all.

In this way men must be instructed, that every one among the precepts of God, how small soever the matter as to which it prescribes, ought to be sacred to us: for when negligence in regard to the minutest matter (the observance of which the Lord has enjoined by his Law) finds its way into the minds of men, contempt of the whole Law and its righteousness gradually creeps in and follows. Those absurd describers of Religion to whom the objectors refer, those I mean (if there are any such) who make it wholly consist in merely abominating the Mass, it is so far from being my intention to defend, that I think their error ought to be strenuously resisted; nor do I think that persons by whom the whole force of piety is for the most part enervated are entitled to be recognised as Christians at all. But though they act absurdly by confining Religion to one of its minutest portions, it does not follow that that minute portion is no part of religion at all.

Those who infer that the Mass is not to be greatly detested, from the fact that some falsely suppose piety to be nothing more than detestation of the Mass, just act as one who should hold that theft and murder are to be disregarded, because some in the present day, who most strictly avenge them, pardon adultery, perjury, and blasphemy!

Our Lord did not so act. For when he rebuked the hypocrisy of the Scribes and Pharisees, who strictly observed the minutest points of the Law, but overlooked its weightiest matters, judgment, mercy, and faith, (Luke xi. 42,) he did not teach that the latter were to be done and the former omitted; but that the latter should be done and the former not

omitted. Wherefore, I hinder not our objectors from justly censuring the inconsiderate conduct of those who, winking at faults both more numerous and more grave, reserve all their detestation for the Mass ; but if they would do what is right—not only justly censure their error, but reform it—let them not take away that to which they attach an excessive importance, (since it cannot be taken away without injury to piety,) but, while admitting that it is not to be neglected, admonish them that there are other matters not less deserving of attention. You see, my dear brother, how widely this subject extends, were I to give full scope to my observations upon it ; but feeling confident that I have to do with men who will yield to the Truth the moment they recognise it, all I intended was to point out where the Truth lies, with the utmost possible brevity.

I am not unaware of the excuse employed by some to spare the weakness of the flesh, and by others to cloak their cowardice ! They say they allow themselves no more than was conceded by Elisha, the Prophet of the Lord, to Naaman, captain of the host of the king of Syria. (2 Kings v. 18.) He having been converted from the vanity of idols to the worship of the One God, and having confessed that there was no God in the whole earth but the God of Israel, asked one thing to be permitted him of the Lord, viz., that it should not be unlawful for him to go into the house of Rimmon with his master and worship there ; and the Prophet, in answer to the request, sent him away in peace. Now, they say, if it was not unlawful to worship in the temple of an idol, why should it not be lawful for us to worship God in those temples which have been dedicated to His Name, though we seem to do something else ? I wish they were as acute and clear-sighted in discovering the straight line of duty, as they shew themselves ingenious in searching out subterfuges ! I wish they would rather follow the way to which they hear themselves distinctly called by so many notifications from God, than turn aside into a path not well known, and trodden by the feet of only a single individual ! For while in regard to all other matters, it is scarcely safe to insist on singular examples, when anything

is said to have been done by the special permission of God, this is particularly dangerous in regard to a Confession of Faith, in which every man ought to be regulated by the measure of knowledge which has been bestowed upon him. This, however, is their matter, and I will give in to them at once if I do not shew that their conduct bears no resemblance, in any of its features, to the example of Naaman. If, on the other hand, I shall make it plain that nothing was farther from Naaman's thoughts than the thing with which they charge him, let them cease to excuse themselves on a false pretext.

Naaman, before he made that request, had promised that henceforth he would perform sacred rites to no god but the God of Israel. I hold that under this promise was comprehended a testimony by which he should make both the king and the whole Syrian nation aware of his religion. But when a most powerful sovereign (who behoved to appease his gods by daily sacrifices, if he felt any obligation in regard to them, and who probably had been accustomed so to do) was aware that Naaman, during his whole life, would never more propitiate them even by a sprinkling of incense, could any one doubt that he had abjured those gods on whom he would not deign to bestow any honour? Why then does he afterwards request permission to adore in the idol's temple? Let them prove that he asked and obtained this permission from the Prophet for the purpose of feigning superstition, and I will not add another word: but if the words of the Sacred History proclaim that it was far otherwise, the difficulty is easily solved, especially when it is manifest, that after he had published his religion in the manner in which he promised to do, there was no room to doubt that he despised all idols, and held them in execration.

The request put into regular form is simply this: Should my Sovereign go into the house of Rimmon and worship, leaning on my arm, let not my lord impute it as guilt in his servant, should I at the same time worship in the house of Rimmon. If they observe not that the expression respecting the king leaning upon him, which is so plainly and distinctly used, was not introduced without a cause, they are

very blind. For by it, it is placed beyond dispute that he asked permission for no other kind of worship than simply that of accommodating himself to the bending posture of the king, whom he was supporting and holding up. This was not to feign worship to an idol, but to perform duty and service to his Sovereign. Now, then, if they would imitate Naaman, let them not be unlike him in the only thing for which I blame them. Let them hold that in common with him by which alone his act was free from censure ; I mean, let them first free themselves from all suspicion of Idolatry, and make it manifest to the consciences of all men, how utterly, with their whole heart, they abhor those superstitions as to which there might otherwise be doubt. When they have done so it will be time to consider how far I am to concede to them permission to be present at Mass, and other profane rites of the same nature, in the discharge of civil duty, as in attendance at the Funerals of kindred, or the celebration of Marriage.

They seek some countenance from a passage in the Epistle which is said to have been written by Jeremiah to the Israelites, when in exile at Babylon. (Baruch vi. 3.) As the Prophet, or whoever was the author of the Epistle, there advised the captive people that whenever they saw gods of silver and gold carried about on men's shoulders, and the crowd standing round in stupid amazement, they should not imitate them in their stupor, but, worshipping in their heart, say, "Thee, O Lord, it behoves us to adore!" so our objectors maintain, that when they are present at the sacrilegious rites of the present age, they lift up their hearts to the Lord, and reflect that it is to Him their adoration belongs. As if the Prophet, when he called them to inward adoration of heart, did not intimate how perilous it would be to gratify the Babylonians by assuming features expressive of the worship of images. As every one sees that his only object was to urge his countrymen, seeing they had no power to check the public superstition of a nation under whose power and yoke they were living, privately to retain their religion unimpaired in their own minds, our worthy objectors have no ground for bringing him forward as the patron of their Idolatry!

Could they be induced to weigh their actions, even in the balance of the Prophet, they would easily see that in appealing to him they are ruining their cause. What kind of person, pray, must he be, or rather where can the person possibly exist who, while his conscience inwardly declares to God that He alone ought to be adored, is able to frame his features and outward gestures so as to express adoration of an Idol? I therefore ask them, with what conscience, at the very moment of acknowledging to themselves that adoration is due to God only, can they make a public pretence to men of worshipping idols? What do they gain by that secret confession, but just to accuse their outward idolatry before the Divine tribunal, on the testimony of their own mind? It is therefore merely a false pretence to say that in such wicked dissembling they are complying with the Prophet's advice. I ask no more of them than the writer, whoever he may have been, demands of his countrymen, namely, that when they see the sacred name of God publicly profaned, they sanctify Him in themselves by tacit mental vows, at the same time bewaring of making it appear by any outward act, that they are sharers in that manifestation.

But still, if there is anything sinful in that dissimulation, they endeavour to shew that they are countenanced in the sin by the example of Paul, (Acts xxi. 26,) who employed fiction not very unlike it when, to recover favour with his nation, he rehearsed a vow, the ceremony of which he knew to have been abolished with the other shadows of the Law, and, in order to pay it, stood in the Temple shorn and purified according to the prescription of the Law, exhibiting himself to all spectators. I will not here say, what I am sure would call forth a smile from some of them, that we act improperly in holding forth that act of guile on Paul's part as fit for imitation—an act which, rebuked by its unhappy result, the Lord declared to have been by no means pleasing to him—since I see no ground here for charging the Apostle with any criminal guile. But I say that they are utterly in error when they suppose that Paul's innocent shaving, in which there was no taint of impure superstition, is to be compared with sacrilegious rites. For,

granting that the purification and oblation of the Nazarites belonged to the class of ceremonies which behoved to vanish away on the appearance of Christ, along with the other figures of the Mosaic law, yet, as it had been instituted for no other purpose than to render thanks unto the Lord, and offer the sacrifice of praise, it was specially of the number of those in which it was lawful for the Apostle for a time to make himself a Jew to the Jews, that he might win the Jews. (1 Cor. ix. 20.) Were the sacrifice of the Mass of the same nature as that Oblation, or had they the same intention, as it is evident the Apostle had, I would indeed welcome such benevolent meekness towards weak brethren, and bid them God speed. But I am confident I have already exposed the flagrant iniquity which is inherent in the Mass, and as to their intentions, they themselves are the best witnesses before God!

How vain and frivolous a cavil their last subterfuge is, may be indicated in a single word. They object that there are many good God-fearing men, not yet imbued with a knowledge of the truth, who hold the Mass sacred; while among those of the brethren also, who are not the worst instructed in the Word of God, some are not yet convinced to the full extent of its execrable nature. They allege, therefore, that were they openly to display their contempt of it, they would occasion the most serious offence—offence which it is the part of Christian meekness and moderation to avoid. This were well and prudently said, could you be considered as avoiding offences, not merely when you take care that they do not occur in your own person, but also when you lay offences for your brother's feet, and thereby cause him to stumble at Christ himself. For what else do those men do when they endeavour, by a show of respect for the Mass, not to offend those altogether untaught, or those not yet fully confirmed? They indeed avert offence from themselves, but they entice others, by their example, to offend God.

Such is not the doctrine of the Lord, who would have us to please all, (Rom. xv. 1, 2,) but only for their good; who enjoins us to accommodate ourselves to the weak but to

edification—a course certainly not followed by those who, when they see their simplicity ensnared by a most pernicious error, only entangle them the more. Hence it happens, that while they all profess to be withheld by a fear of giving offence, but are, in fact, afraid of exciting indignation against themselves, no one begins to be distinguished from others by the sincerity and purity of his conduct. To what can we suppose it to be owing that not one out of so great a multitude is awakened in this respect, but just that, while each keeps looking at another, none direct their eyes to God; and while every one is considering what others do, no man measures his duty by the proper rule, the Word of God? While in this way they are mutually weaving snares for one another, they presume to make mention of offences which have no existence, or would have none, did not they themselves place them in the plain and open path.

Now, dearest brother, let my discourse have reference to yourself. Although you are already aware what course remains for you, since you see the direction in which you are led by the Word of God, to which all your deliberations ought to be conformed and confined, still, that I may not be wanting to you in your great straits, I will proceed, with all possible brevity, to lay down The Rule of Duty, as requested in your letter. Only be you, on your part, prepared and eager to listen to the voice of the Lord, and to execute his commandments with intrepid and unwavering constancy; and, finally, remember that in truth it is not so much a counsel given you by man, as an oracle pronounced by man's lips, but received from the sacred lips of Almighty God.

I. First, then, consider it a thing altogether interdicted to allow any man to see you communicating in the Sacrilege of the Mass, or uncovering your head before an Image, or observing any form of Superstition belonging to the class of those by which, as shewn above, the glory of God is obscured, his religion profaned, and his truth corrupted. None of these things can you do without giving the wicked a confession most insulting to God, and dragging weak brethren

to fatal ruin by your example. But while you conduct yourself thus, (if, indeed, it is not your intention to proceed to a more open confession,) you must at the same time take good heed, as far as in you lies, that those miserable and blind idolaters (to whom, when their superstition is removed, God and Religion appear to be utterly abolished) are not led to imagine, when they see you holding their Idols in ridicule or contempt, that you are a derider and contemner of God also. This you will in some measure accomplish if you seldom appear at their sacred meetings, and regulate your whole life so as to give it something of a religious character. Come then, most excellent sir, let such zeal for piety, goodness, continence, charity, chastity, and inoffensiveness appear, as may completely clear you in the eyes of all men from any suspicion of impiety, so that, while the weak and superstitious are offended at your not being like themselves, they may be forced, whether they will or no, to acknowledge that you are a servant of God.

II. In the second place, unless you are preparing to give any one an exposition of your faith, indulge their bigotry so far as not to push yourself forward at the time when they are performing their Rites, causelessly to make a display of contempt, which you are aware that they (such is their ignorance !) will regard as sheer impiety against God. For what gain can accrue to yourself or others from being suspected to be an atheist, utterly devoid of all religious feeling ? But, while I advise you not voluntarily, or of set purpose, to give ground for such suspicion, still, if by circumstances you are accidentally brought into a dubious position, any suspicion is better far than to let them see you acting the idolater ! If in your general conduct you exhibit the sanctity of a Christian man, your integrity will afford you sufficient protection against the shafts of slander.

Then you must be particularly careful in regulating your household, over which you should consider that you have been set, not merely that each may yield you obedience and service, but be religiously brought up in the fear of the Lord, and imbued with the best discipline. For if it is truly said by Aristotle, that " Every man's house is the image

of a little kingdom, in which the head of the family, as chief, makes laws by which he may train those under him to all justice and innocence," not even in human judgment is he excusable who, careless as to the regulation of his family, provided it is sedulous and dutiful towards himself, allows it to be flagitious in regard to God and man. You ought even to rise higher in your thoughts, and consider, that those persons of whom the Lord has made you master are committed to your trust, He having placed them under you that you may teach and accustom them, first of all, to obey and serve him; and next, under him, obey and serve yourself.

Not, therefore, without cause did the Apostle, (1 Tim. v. 8,) when speaking of those who cast off all anxiety as to the administration of their household, inflict on them the heavy censure that they have "denied the faith, and are worse than infidels." For what else is it than to refuse and desert the post assigned by God, and to renounce His vocation? But then most servants are of a very bad disposition, and the old proverb almost always holds true—"As many servants in the house, so many enemies!" This, indeed, is vulgarly thought and alleged, but it is not so. We get them not as enemies, but make them so by our own fault, while we bring them up like brute beasts, without doctrine, without the knowledge of God, without pious training, forgetting that they are our fellow-servants, and have been committed to our charge by a heavenly Master. Will the Scripture never bestow praise on a Christian man, without adding that he and his whole house believed, (John iv. 53,) and shall we boast of faith in Christ, while fostering the denial of him within the walls of our house, in the persons of our servants? Wherefore, if the first requisite in a good householder is to manage his household rightly, and in order—and the household of a Christian man can then only be considered duly arranged, when it exhibits the appearance of a little Bethel—it must be your careful endeavour not to leave yours ignorant or devoid of piety.

There is no ground for being deterred by such vulgar scruples as these—Shall I make a servant the disposer of

my life? Shall I put a drawn sword into his hand to kill me? Grant, first, that the members of your household are of such disposition and natural temper as promise no good, still, having obtained them, dare to imbue them with the doctrine of God, and to sow within them the seed of his word. God himself will provide the rest, and give a success which will never allow you to repent of having obeyed His commands. And certainly, if you are not willing to impose upon yourself, you must see how much more annoyance you must have, to how much greater danger you must be exposed, within the recesses of your house, among persons whom you consider as sentinels placed over you, whose snares you are always fearing, and the fear of whom meets you at every corner, so that you scarcely dare to breathe without looking round to see whether they observe you. Surely this were worse than once for all to try their fidelity, though it should be at your peril!

The Lord has many ways of avenging contempt of his Word. In contracting Marriage (seeing that the Lord has hitherto left your liberty in this respect entire) consider in what fetters you entangle yourself, if you take a wife differing from you in religion! And yet, why should I bid you consider those labyrinths, which no one can well comprehend but he who has actually had experience of them? I wish you may rather fear and beware, than be willing to make the trial. I know the flattering thought. She now opposes in such a manner that I am confident she will gradually give in! Do not vainly promise this of yourself, but of the Lord, seeing a good wife is His special gift. (Prov. xix. 14.) And how can you expect a good wife from Him whom you will not hear while strictly prohibiting you from being "yoked with unbelievers?" (2 Cor. vi. 14.)

You have the advice which you asked of me, or rather you have it from the Lord, through my hand—an advice indeed perilous, and little flattering to your faith, but faithful and salutary to your soul; I add, altogether necessary to you, if you do not wish to shake off the yoke of the Lord from your neck, and abjure His Religion!

Your part now is to render to the Lord the confession of praise which he demands of you, to exhort yourself to be instant and urgent, to arouse and collect your courage. For the servant of God to give way, especially at such an important crisis of Religion, were most foolish and unworthy. That you may ever and anon call to mind and daily yield submission to what I have declared above, I now in your presence call God and his holy Angels to witness, that the controversy now agitated is no less than this—How are we to avoid denying Christ before men, so as not to be denied by Him, (as the Apostle threatens, 2 Tim. ii. 12,) when seated for judgment on his Supreme Tribunal?

That you may not think any special burden is laid upon you, which every one is not called to bear, I can easily meet any such erroneous impression. I do not ask you openly to profess your piety; all I ask is, that you do not abjure it for the profession of impiety! For what else have I aimed at in the whole of this Discussion, or what do I wish to obtain now, but just that you may not pollute the holy Religion of God by horrible sacrilege—that you may not profane your body, which he has dedicated as a temple to himself, by foul abominations—that you may not inscribe your name on execrable blasphemies? Do we account all these things to be of so little moment, that we are not prepared to shun them at some peril to our life, or, if need be, at the shedding of our blood? Nay, surely we estimate this brief miserable life too highly, if we think it worthy to be ransomed by such impiety; and we have too much fear of death, if we think it in any respect more grievous than to purchase pardon from man by becoming sacrilegious, apostate, perfidious, treacherous before God—if we would rather hear Christ pronounce us unworthy of being counted his disciples, than be counted by men worthy to die—if, in short, from fear of death we resign the hope of eternal life!

O the empty vanity of our boasting, whether we found it on our faith in Christ, or on any other title! Can we allow the Poet, who thought death "terrible destruction," to exclaim in the person of another uttering his own sentiment, "Is it

so very miserable a thing to die?" And shall we, who have been taught by the Word of God that it is nothing else than an entrance, by momentary pain, into immortal life and blessed rest, reply, that it is indeed a miserable thing to die? O seven times wretched we, whom Paul declares (1 Cor. xv. 19) to be "of all men the most miserable," if we have confidence in the present life only!

Perhaps you will say, It is easy for men sitting in the lap of ease thus to talk of flames, just as it is easy to philosophize on war while in the shade; but were the reality before you, your feelings would be different! Though I hope better things from the goodness of Him by whose power we can do all things, and doubt not that in whatever contest he may permit me to be engaged, he will maintain me in the same resolution to my last breath, still I am unwilling that you should turn your eyes upon myself.

The things which I set before you are not those which I have meditated with myself in my shady nook, but those which the invincible martyrs of God realized amid gibbets, and flames, and ravenous beasts! Had not their courage been thus whetted, they would in an instant have perfidiously abjured the eternal truth, which they intrepidly sealed with their blood. They did not set us an example of constancy in asserting the truth that we should now desert it, when handed down to us so signed and sealed; but they taught us the art by which, trusting to the Divine protection, we stand invincible by all the powers of death, hell, the world, and Satan! Farewell.

PSYCHOPANNYCHIA:

OR,

A REFUTATION OF THE ERROR ENTERTAINED BY SOME UNSKILFUL PERSONS,

WHO IGNORANTLY IMAGINE THAT

IN THE INTERVAL BETWEEN DEATH AND THE JUDGMENT

THE SOUL SLEEPS.

TOGETHER WITH AN EXPLANATION OF

THE CONDITION AND LIFE OF THE SOUL AFTER THIS PRESENT LIFE.

PREFACE

BY

JOHN CALVIN TO A FRIEND.

Long ago, when certain pious persons invited, and even urged me, to publish something for the purpose of repressing the extravagance of those who, alike ignorantly and tumultuously, maintain that THE SOUL DIES OR SLEEPS, I could not be induced by all their urgency, so averse did I feel to engage in that kind of dispute. At that time, indeed, I was not without excuse, partly because I hoped that that absurd dogma would soon vanish of its own accord, or at least be confined to a few triflers; partly because I did not think it expedient to engage with a party whose camp and weapons and stratagems I was scarcely acquainted with. For, as yet, nothing had reached me except murmurs and hoarse sounds, so that, to engage with those who had not yet come forth into the arena, seemed to be nothing better than blindly striking the air. The result, however, has been different from what I hoped. These babblers have so actively exerted themselves, that they have already drawn thousands into their insanity. And even the error itself has, I see, been aggravated. At first, some only vaguely alleged that THE SOUL SLEEPS, without defining what they wished to be understood by "sleep." Afterwards arose those ψυχοκτονοι, who murder Souls, though without inflicting a wound. The error of the former, indeed, was not to be borne; but I think that the madness of the latter ought to be severely repressed. Both are unsupported by reason and judgment; but it is not so easy to persuade others of this without openly refuting their vanity, and exposing it, so to speak, to their face. This is only to be done by exhibiting it as it appears in their writings. They are said to circulate their follies in a kind of Tracts, which I have never happened to see. I have only received some notes from a friend, who had taken down what he had cursorily heard from their lips, or collected by some other means.

Although one reason for my not writing has been partially removed by these notes, the other still remains. However, while the men by whispers, and a garrulity for which they are remarkable, stealthily insinuate themselves, and ensnare no fewer in their error than the circulation of printed books could enable them to do, I feel that I could not well defend myself from the charge of being a traitor to the Truth were I, in such urgent circumstances, to keep back and remain silent! And, while I trust that my labour will be of the greatest use to the more unskilful and less experienced, and not without some use also to the moderately instructed who have given some slight attention to the subject, I will not hesitate to give a reason of my faith to all the good—not such a reason, perhaps, as may fully equip them both for defence and for carrying the war into the enemies' camp, but such a one as will not leave them altogether unarmed. Had the importunity of these men in circulating their dreams among the vulgar allowed me, I would willingly have declined a contest of this nature, in which the fruit gained is not equal to the labour expended, this being one of the cases to which the Apostle's exhortation to be soberly wise particularly applies. But though we long for this soberness, they will not allow us to employ it. Still, my endeavour will be to treat the subject with moderation, and keep it within due bounds.

I wish some other method of cutting away the evil, which makes far too much progress, had been devised, so as to prevent it from gaining ground daily, and eating in like a cancer. Nor does it now appear for the first time; for we read that it originated with some Arabs, who maintained that "The soul dies with the body, and that both rise again at the Day of Judgment." (Euseb. Eccl. Hist. lib. vi. c. 36; Aug. lib. de Haeres. c. lxxxiii. dist. 16; John ii.) Some time after, John, Bishop of Rome, broached it, and was forced to recant by the Theological Faculty of Paris. (Gerson. in Sermone Pasch. priore.) It lay smouldering for some ages, but has lately begun to send forth sparks, being stirred up by some dregs of Anabaptists. These, spread abroad far and wide, have kindled torches—and would that they were soon extinguished by that voluntary rain which the Lord hath set apart for his inheritance!

I will plead the cause without hatred to any man, without personal affront to any man, in short, without any bitterness of invective, so that no one shall be able to complain of being hurt, or even slightly offended. And yet, in the present day, persons may be seen giving full scope to a carping, biting, scoffing temper, who, if

you were only to lay a finger on them, would make a lamentable outcry that "the Unity of the Church is rent in pieces, and Charity violated!" To such let this be our answer: *First*, That we acknowledge no Unity except in Christ; no Charity of which He is not the bond; and that, therefore, the chief point in preserving Charity is to maintain Faith sacred and entire. *Secondly*, That this Discussion may proceed without any violation of charity, provided the ears with which they listen correspond with the tongue which I employ.

To you, Honoured Sir, I have thought it right to dedicate this small Tract on many accounts, but on one account especially,—because I see that, amid those tumults of vain opinions with which giddy spirits disturb the peace of the Church, you stand firm and complete in prudence and moderation.

Orleans, 1534.

TO THE READER.

On again reading this discussion, I observe that, in the heat of argument, some rather severe and harsh expressions have escaped me, which may, perhaps, give offence to delicate ears; and as I know that there are some good men into whose minds some part of this dogma has been instilled, either from excessive credulity or ignorance of Scripture, with which at the time they were not armed so as to be able to resist, I am unwilling to give them offence so far as they will allow me, since they are neither perverse nor malicious in their error. I wish, therefore, to warn such beforehand not to take anything said as an affront to themselves, but to understand that, whenever I use some freedom of speech, I am referring to the nefarious herd of Anabaptists, from whose fountain this noxious stream did, as I observed, first flow, and against whom nothing I have said equals their deserts. If I am to have a future fight with them, I am determined they shall find me, if not a very skilful, yet certainly a firm, and as I dare promise, by God's grace, an invincible defender of the Truth. And yet against them I have not given immoderate vent to my bile, having constantly refrained from all pertness and petulance of speech; tempering my pen so as to be fitter for teaching than forcing, and yet able to draw such as are unwilling to be led. It was certainly much more my intention to bring all back into the right way, than to provoke them to anger.

All who are to read I exhort and beseech by the Name of God, and of our Lord Jesus Christ, that they bring an impartial judgment and a mind prepared as it were to be the seat of truth. I am aware of the power which novelty has to tickle the ears of certain persons: but we ought to reflect that "Truth has only one voice" —that which proceeds from the lips of our Lord. To Him alone ought we to open our ears when the doctrine of Salvation is in question, while to all others we should keep them shut. His word, I say, is not new, but that which was from the beginning, is, and always shall be. And as those err who, when the word of God, which had been laid aside through perverse custom or sloth, is brought to light, charge it with novelty; so they err, in the other direction, who are like reeds driven by the wind, nay, nod and bend at the slightest breeze! When we speak of learning Christ, do we mean that we are to lend an ear, without regard to the word of God, to any doctrine even though true? If you receive it as from man, will you not embrace falsehood with the same facility? For what has man of his own save vanity?

Such was not the conduct of those who, when they had received the word, searched the Scriptures to see whether these things were so (Acts xvii. 11)—a noble example, if we would imitate it; but we, I know not from what sloth, or rather contempt, receive the word of God in such a way that when we have learned three syllables, we immediately swell up with an opinion of wisdom, and think ourselves rich men and kings! Hence, you see so many who, unlearned themselves, keep tragically bawling out about the ignorance of the age! But what can you do? They are called, and would wish to be thought Christians, because they have got a slight knowledge of some commonplaces; and as they would be ashamed to be ignorant of anything, they with the greatest confidence, as if from a tripod, give forth decisions upon all things. Hence so many schisms, so many errors, so many stumblingblocks to our faith, through which the name and word of God are blasphemed among the ungodly. At length, (this is the head of the evil!) while they proceed obstinately to defend whatever they have once rashly babbled, they begin to consult the oracles of God, in order that they may there find support to their errors. Then, good God! what do they not pervert, what do they not adulterate and corrupt, that they may, I do not say bend, but distort it to their own view? As was truly said by the poet, "Fury supplies armour."

Is this the way of learning—to roll the Scriptures over and over, and twist them about in search of something that may minister to

our lust, or to force them into subjection to our sense? Nothing can be more absurd than this, O pernicious pest! O tares certainly sown by an enemy's hand, for the purpose of rendering the true seed useless! And do we still wonder at the many sects among those who had at first given in their adherence to the gospel and the reviving word? I, for my part, am terrified by the dreadful denunciation, "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." (Matt. xxi. 43.)

Here, however, I desist from my complaints: for I should write a large volume were I to declaim in just terms on the perversity of this age. Let us, brethren, warned by so many examples, at length, though late, become wise. Let us always hang on our Lord's lips, and neither add to His wisdom nor mix up with it anything of our own, lest like leaven it corrupt the whole mass, and make even the very salt which is within us to be without savour. Let us shew ourselves to be such disciples as our Lord wishes to have—poor, empty, and void of self-wisdom: eager to learn but knowing nothing, and even wishing to know nothing but what He has taught; shunning everything of foreign growth as the deadliest poison.

I would here obviate the objections of those who will blame my present undertaking, charging me with stirring up fierce contests about nothing, and making trifling differences the source of violent dissensions: for there are not wanting some who so reproach me. My answer is, that when Divine Truth is avowedly attacked, we must not tolerate the adulteration of one single *iota* of it. It is certainly no trivial matter to see God's light extinguished by the devil's darkness; and besides, this matter is of greater moment than many suppose. Nor is it true, as they allege, that he who does not acquiesce in the errors of others, shews deadly hate by dissenting from them. I have censured the curiosity of those who would agitate questions which are truly nothing else than mere tortures to the intellect. But after they have stirred this *camarina*, their temerity must be repressed, lest it should prevail over the truth. Whether I have succeeded in this I know not: it was certainly my wish, and I have done the best I could. If others can do better, let them come forward for the public good!

BASEL, 1536.

PSYCHOPANNYCHIA.

In following out this Discussion, I will not labour the matter much, but endeavour to explain myself with the greatest simplicity and clearness. In every Discussion, indeed, it is of the greatest consequence that the subject be clearly seen by the writer, and laid distinctly before his readers; lest either he wander beyond his bounds, and lose himself in mere loquacity, or they, ignorant of the ground, go astray from not knowing the road. This is particularly necessary to be observed when the subject is matter of controversy, since there we do not merely propose to teach, but have to do with an opponent who (such is man's temper) certainly will not, if he can help it, allow himself to be vanquished, nor will confess defeat so long as he can sport and make a diversion by cavilling rejoinders and tergiversation. The best method of pressing an enemy and holding him fast so that he cannot escape, is to exhibit the controverted point, and explain it so distinctly and clearly, that you can bring him at once as it were to close quarters.

Our controversy, then, relates to THE HUMAN SOUL. Some, while admitting it to have a real existence, imagine that it sleeps in a state of insensibility from Death to The Judgment-day, when it will awake from its sleep; while others will sooner admit anything than its real existence, maintaining that it is merely a vital power which is derived from arterial spirit on the action of the lungs, and being unable to exist without body, perishes along with the body, and vanishes away and becomes evanescent till the period when the whole man shall be raised again. We, on the other hand, maintain both that it is a substance, and after the death of the body

truly lives, being endued both with sense and understanding. Both these points we undertake to prove by clear passages of Scripture. Here let human wisdom give place; for though it thinks much about the soul it perceives no certainty with regard to it. Here, too, let Philosophers give place, since on almost all subjects their regular practice is to put neither end nor measure to their dissensions, while on this subject in particular they quarrel, so that you will scarcely find two of them agreed on any single point! Plato, in some passages, talks nobly of the faculties of the soul; and Aristotle, in discoursing of it, has surpassed all in acuteness. But what the soul is, and whence it is, it is vain to ask at them, or indeed at the whole body of Sages, though they certainly thought more purely and wisely on the subject than some amongst ourselves, who boast that they are the disciples of Christ.

But before proceeding farther, we must cut off all handle for logomachy, which might be furnished by our giving the name of "soul" and "spirit" indiscriminately to that which is the subject of controversy, and yet sometimes speaking of the two as different. By Scripture usage different meanings are given to these terms; and most people, without attending to this difference, take up the first meaning which occurs to them, keep fast hold of it, and pertinaciously maintain it. Others, having seen "soul" sometimes used for "*life*," hold this to be invariably the case, and will not allow themselves to be convinced of the contrary. If met with the passage from David, "Their soul will be blessed in life," (Psalm xlix. 19,) they will interpret, that their life is blessed in life. In like manner, if the passage from Samuel be produced, "By thy life, and by thy soul's life," (2 Sam. xi. 11,) they will say, that there is no meaning in these terms. We know that "soul" is very often used for *life* in such passages as the following, "My soul is in my hands,"—"Why do I tear my flesh with my teeth, and carry my soul in my hands?"—"Is not the soul more than meat,"—"Thou fool, this night shall thy soul be required of thee." (Psalm cxix. 109; Job xiii. 14; Matt. vi. 25; Luke xii. 20.) There are other similar passages which these soul-slayers always have in

their mouth. There is no ground, however, for their great self-complacency, since they ought to observe that *soul* is there used metonymically for *life*, because the soul is the cause of life, and life depends on the soul—a figure which boys learn even from their rudiments. It is impossible not to wonder at the presumption of these men, who have so high an opinion of themselves, and would fain be thought wise by others, though they require to be taught the use of figures and the first elements of speech. In this sense it was said that "the soul of Jonathan was knit to the soul of David"—the soul of Sychem (Shechem) "clave unto Dinah the daughter of Jacob;" and Luke says, that "the multitude of the believers was of one heart and soul." (1 Sam. xviii. 1; Gen. xxxiv. 3; Acts iv. 32.) Who sees not that there is much force in such Hebraisms as the following? "Bless the Lord, O my soul,"—"My soul doth magnify the Lord,"—"Say to my soul, I am thy salvation." (Psalm ciii. 1; civ. 1; Luke i. 46.) An indescribable something more is expressed than if it were said without addition, Bless the Lord; I magnify the Lord, Say to me, I am thy salvation!

Sometimes the word "soul" is used merely for *a living man*, as when sixty souls are said to have gone down into Egypt. (Exod. i. 5.) Again, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die,"—"The soul which turneth aside to wizards and soothsayers shall die the death," &c. (Ezek. xxviii. 4; Lev. xx. 6.) Sometimes also it is called the *breath* which men inhale and respire, and in which the vital motion of the body resides. In this sense I understand the following passages, "Anxiety seizes me, though my whole soul is still in me,"—"His soul is in him,"—"Let the soul of the child return within him." (2 Sam. i. 9; Acts xx. 10; 1 Kings xvii. 21.) Nay, in the very same sense in which we say, in ordinary language, that the soul is "breathed out" and "expires," Scripture speaks of the soul "departing," as when it is said of Rachel, "And when her soul was departing (for she died) she called the name of the child Benoni." (Gen. xxxv. 18.)

We know that spirit is *literally* "breath" and "wind," and for this reason is frequently called πνοὴν by the Greeks.

We know that it is used by Isaiah for a thing vain and worthless, "We have conceived and brought forth spirit," or "wind." (Isaiah xxvi. 18.) It is very often taken for what is *regenerated* in us by the Spirit of God. For when Paul says that "the spirit lusteth against the flesh," (Gal. v. 17,) he does not mean that the soul fights with the flesh, or reason with desire; but that the soul itself, in as far as it is governed by the Spirit of God, wrestles with itself, though in as far as it is still devoid of the Spirit of God, it is subject to its lusts. We know that when the two terms are joined, "soul" means *will*, and "spirit" means *intellect*. Isaiah thus speaks, "My soul hath longed for thee in the night, but I will also wake to thee in my spirit within me." (Isaiah xxvi. 9.) And when Paul prays that the Thessalonians may be entire in spirit, and soul, and body, so that they may be without blame at the coming of Jesus Christ, (1 Thess. v. 23,) his meaning is, that they may think and will all things rightly, and may not use their members as instruments of unrighteousness. To the same effect the Apostle elsewhere says, that "the word of God is quick and piercing, like a two-edged sword, reaching to the division of soul and spirit, of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts of the heart." (Heb. iv. 12.) In this last passage, however, some understand by "spirit" that reasoning and willing essence of which we now dispute; and by "soul," the vital motion and senses which philosophers call superior and inferior, *i.e.*, ὁρμαὶ καὶ αἰσθήσεις. But since in numerous passages both parties hold it to mean the immortal essence which is the cause of life in man, let them not raise disputes about mere names, but attend to the thing itself, by whatever name distinguished. How real it is let us now shew.

And we will begin with man's creation, wherein we shall see of what nature he was made at first. The Sacred History tells us (Gen. i. 26) of the purpose of God, before man was created, to make him "*after his own image and likeness.*" These expressions cannot possibly be understood of his body, in which, though the wonderful work of God appears more than in all other creatures, his image nowhere

shines forth. (Ambros. lib. 6, hex. August. cap. iv. de Trinit. et alibi.) For who is it that speaks thus, "Let us make man in our own image and likeness?" God himself, who is a Spirit, and cannot be represented by any bodily shape. But as a bodily image, which exhibits the external face, ought to express to the life all the traits and features, that thus the statue or picture may give an idea of all that may be seen in the original, so this image of God must, by its likeness, implant some knowledge of God in our minds. I hear that some triflers say that the image of God refers to the dominion which was given to man over the brutes, and that in this respect man has some resemblance to God, whose dominion is over all. Into this mistake even Chrysostom fell when he was carried away in the heat of debate against the insane Anthropomorphites. But Scripture does not allow its meaning to be thus evaded: for Moses, to prevent any one from placing this image in the flesh of man, first narrates that the body was formed out of clay, and makes no mention of the image of God; thereafter, he says, that "the breath of life" was introduced into this clay body, making the image of God not to become effulgent in man till he was complete in all his parts. What then, it will be asked, do you think that that breath of life is the image of God? No, indeed, although I might say so with many, and perhaps not improperly. (Hilar. in Ps. 63; Aug. Lib. de Spiritu et Anima, cap. 39; Basil, hex. Hom. 8.) For what if I should maintain that the distinction was constituted by the word of God, by which that breath of life is distinguished from the souls of brutes? For whence do the souls of other animals arise? God says, "Let the earth bring forth the living soul," &c. Let that which has sprung of earth be resolved into earth. But the soul of man is not of the earth. It was made by the mouth of the Lord, *i.e.*, by his secret power.

Here, however, I do not insist, lest it should become a ground of quarrel. All I wish to obtain is, that the image itself is separate from the flesh. Were it otherwise, there would be no great distinction in man from its being said that he was made *in the image of God;* and yet it is repeatedly brought forward in Scripture, and highly celebrated.

For what occasion was there to introduce God as deliberating, and, as it were, making it a subject of consultation, whether he should make an ordinary creature? In regard to all these things, "He spake, and it was done." When he comes to this image, as if he were about to give a singular manifestation, he calls in his wisdom and power, and meditates with himself before he puts his hand to the work. Were these figurative modes of expression which represent the Lord, *ἀνθρωποπαθῶς*, (in a human manner,) in adaptation to our feeble capacity, so anxiously employed by Moses for a thing of nought? Was it not rather to give an exalted idea of the image of God impressed on man? Not contented with saying it once, he repeats it again and again. Whatever philosophers or these dreamers may pretend, we hold that nothing can bear the image of God but spirit, since God is a Spirit.

Here we are not left to conjecture what resemblance this image bears to its archetype. We easily learn it from the Apostle. (Col. iii. 10.) When he enjoins us to "put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him who created him," he clearly shews what this image is, or wherein it consists; as he also does when he says, (Eph. iv. 24,) "Put on the new man, who has been created after God in knowledge and true holiness." When we would comprehend all these things, in one word we say, that man, in respect of spirit, was made partaker of the wisdom, justice, and goodness of God. This mode of expression was followed by two sacred writers. The one, in dividing man into two parts—*body*, taken from the earth, and *soul*, derived from the image of God—briefly comprehended what Moses had more fully expressed, (Ecclus. xvii. 1,) "God created man, and made him after his own image." The other, desiring to state exegetically how far the image of God extended, called man "inexterminable," because created in the image of God. (Wisdom ii. 23.) I would not urge the authority of these writers strongly on our opponents, did they not allege them against us. Still they ought to have some weight, if not as canonical, at least as ancient pious writers strongly supported. But, leaving them, let us hold

the image of God in man to be that which can only have its seat in the Spirit.

Let us now hear what *Scripture* more distinctly states concerning the Soul. When Peter speaks of the salvation of the soul, and says that carnal lusts war against the soul; when he enjoins us to keep our souls chaste, and calls Christ the "Bishop of our souls," (1 Peter i. 9, 22; 2 Peter ii. 25,) what could he mean but that there were souls which could be saved—which could be assailed by vicious desires—which could be kept chaste, and be ruled by Christ their Bishop? In the history of Job we read, (Job iv. 19,) "How much more those who dwell in houses of clay, and have a foundation of earth?" This, if you attend to it, you must see to apply to the soul, which dwells in a clay body. He did not call man a vessel of clay, but says that he inhabits a vessel of clay, as if the good part of man (which is the soul) were contained in that earthly abode. Thus Peter says, (1 Peter i. 13,) "I think it right, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by way of remembrance, knowing that in a short time I must put off this my tabernacle." By this form of expression we might, if we are not very stupid, understand that there is something in a tabernacle, and something which is taken out of a tabernacle, or which, as he says, is to put off a tabernacle. The same manifest distinction between the flesh and the spirit is made by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, (Heb. xii. 9,) when he calls those by whom we were begotten the parents of one flesh; but says that there is one God, "the Father of spirits." Shortly after, having called God the King of the heavenly Jerusalem, he subjoins that its citizens are angels and "the spirits of just men made perfect." (Heb. xii. 23.) Nor do I see how we can otherwise understand Paul, when he says, (2 Cor. vii. 1,) "Having, therefore, these promises, let us cleanse ourselves from all pollution of the flesh and spirit." For it is clear that he does not there make the comparison which he elsewhere frequently uses when he attributes defilement to the spirit, by which term, in other passages, he merely means purity.

I will add another passage, though I see that those who wish to cavil will immediately betake themselves to their

glosses. The passage is, (1 Cor. ii. 11,) "Who of men knows the things of a man, save the spirit of man that is in him? so also no man knows the things of God, but the Spirit of God." He might have said, that man knows the things which are his; but he applied the name to that part in which the power of thinking and understanding resides. Also, when he said, (Rom. viii. 16,) "The Spirit of God bears witness with our spirit, that we are the sons of God," did he not use the same peculiarity of expression? But, might we not convince them by a single passage? We know how often our Saviour condemned the error of the Sadducees, which partly consisted, as Luke states in the Acts, (Acts xxiii. 8,) in denying the existence of spirit. The words are, "The Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit; but the Pharisees acknowledge all these." I fear they will cavil, and say that the words must be understood of the Holy Spirit or of angels. But this objection is easily met. He both mentioned the angels separately; and it is certain that those Pharisees had no knowledge of the Holy Spirit. This will be still better understood by those who know Greek. Luke uses the term πνεῦμα without adding the article, which he certainly would have added had he been speaking of the Holy Spirit.

If this does not stop their mouths, I do not see by what argument they can either be led or drawn, unless they choose to say that the opinion of the Sadducees, in denying spirit, was not condemned, or that of the Pharisees, in asserting it, approved. This quibble is met by the very words of the Evangelist: for, after stating Paul's confession, "I am a Pharisee," he adds this opinion held by the Pharisees. We must therefore either say that Paul used a crafty and malicious pretence, (this could not be, in a confession of faith!) or that he held with the Pharisees on the subject of spirit.

But if we give credit to *History*, (Eccles. Hist., c. iv. cap. 13,) this belief among the Apostles was as firm and certain as that of The Resurrection of the Dead, or any other leading article of our faith. It will not be out of place here to quote the words of Polycarp, a man breathing the spirit of a martyr in all his words and actions, (Hist. Eccles.,

cap. 19,) one who was a disciple of the Apostles, and so purely delivered what he heard from them to posterity, that he never allowed it to be in any degree adulterated. He, then, among many illustrious sayings which he uttered when brought to the stake, said, that on that day he was to appear before God in spirit. About the same time Melito, Bishop of Sardis, (Hist. Eccl., c. 24,) a man of like integrity, wrote a treatise, On Body and Soul. Were it now extant, our present labour would be superfluous: and so much did this belief prevail in a better age, that Tertullian places it among the common and primary conceptions of the mind which are commonly apprehended by nature. (Tertull. de Resurrect. Carnis.)

Although several arguments have already been advanced which, if I mistake not, establish the point for which I contend, viz., That the spirit or soul of man is a substance distinct from the body, what is now to be added will make the point still more certain. For I come to *The Second Head*, which I propose to discuss, viz., THAT THE SOUL, AFTER THE DEATH OF THE BODY, STILL SURVIVES, ENDUED WITH SENSE AND INTELLECT. And it is a mistake to suppose that I am here affirming anything else than THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL. For those who admit that the soul lives, and yet deprive it of all sense, feign a soul which has none of the properties of soul, or dissever the soul from itself, seeing that its nature, without which it cannot possibly exist, is to move, to feel, to be vigorous, to understand. As Tertullian says, "The soul of the soul is perception." (Lib. de Carne Christi.)

Let us now learn this IMMORTALITY from Scripture. When Christ exhorts his followers not to fear those who can kill the body, but cannot kill the soul, but to fear him who, after he hath killed the body, is able to cast the soul into the fire of Gehenna, (Matt. x. 28,) does he not intimate that the soul survives death? Graciously, therefore, has the Lord acted towards us, in not leaving our souls to the disposal of those who make no scruple of butchering them, or at least attempt it, but without the ability to do so. Tyrants torture, maim, burn, scourge, and hang, but it is only the

body! It is God alone who has power over the soul, and can send it into hell fire. Either, therefore, the soul survives the body, or it is false to say that tyrants have no power over the soul! I hear them reply, that the soul is indeed slain for the present when death is inflicted, but does not perish, inasmuch as it will be raised again. When they would escape in this way, they must grant that neither is the body slain, since it too will rise; and because both are preserved against the day of judgment, neither perishes! But the words of Christ admit that the body is killed, and testify at the same time that the soul is safe. This form of expression Christ uses when he says, (John ii. 19,) "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." He was speaking of the temple of his body. In like manner he exempts it from their power, when, in dying, he commends it into his Father's hands, as Luke writes, and David had foretold. (Luke xxiii. 46; Psalm xxxi. 6.) And Stephen, after his example, says, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!" (Acts vii. 59.) Here they absurdly pretend that Christ commends his life to his Father, and Stephen his to Christ, to be kept against the day of Resurrection. But the words, especially those of Stephen, imply something very different from this. And the Evangelist adds, concerning Christ, that having bowed his head, he delivered his spirit. (John xix. 30.) These words cannot refer to panting or action of the lungs.

Not less evidently does the Apostle Peter shew that, After death, the soul both exists and lives, when he says (1 Pet. i. 19) that Christ preached to the spirits in prison, not merely forgiveness for salvation to the spirits of the righteous, but also confusion to the spirits of the wicked. For so I interpret the passage, which has puzzled many minds; and I am confident that, under favourable auspices, I will make good my interpretation. For after he had spoken of the humiliation of the cross of Christ, and shewn that all the righteous must be conformed to his image, he immediately thereafter, to prevent them from falling into despair, makes mention of the Resurrection, to teach them how their tribulations were to end. For he states that Christ did not fall under death, but, subduing it, came forth victorious. He indeed says in

words, that he was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit," (1 Pet. iii. 18,) but just in the same sense in which Paul says that he suffered in the humiliation of the flesh, but was raised by the power of the Spirit. Now, in order that believers might understand that the power belongs to them also, he subjoins that Christ exerted this power in regard to others, and not only towards the living, but also towards the dead; and, moreover, not only towards his servants, but also towards unbelievers and the despisers of his grace.

Let us understand, moreover, that the sentence is defective, and wants one of its two members. Many examples of this occur in Scripture, especially when, as here, several sentiments are comprehended in one clause. And let no one wonder that the holy Patriarchs who waited for the redemption of Christ are shut up in prison. As they saw the light at a distance, under a cloud and shade, (as those who see the feeble light of dawn or twilight,) and had not yet an exhibition of the divine blessing in which they rested, he gave the name of prison to their expectancy.

The meaning of the Apostle will therefore be, that Christ in spirit preached to those other spirits who were in prison —in other words, that the virtue of the redemption obtained by Christ appeared and was exhibited to the spirits of the dead. Now, there is a want of the other member which related to the pious, who acknowledged and received this benefit; but it is complete in regard to unbelievers, who received this announcement to their confusion. For when they saw but one redemption, from which they were excluded, what could they do but despair? I hear our opponents muttering, and saying that this is a gloss of my own invention, and that such authority does not bind them. I have no wish to bind them to my authority, I only ask them whether or not the spirits shut up in prison are spirits? There is another clearer passage in the same writer, when he says (1 Pet. iv. 6) that the gospel was preached to the dead, in order that they may be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit. You see how, while the flesh is delivered over to death, life is claimed

for the spirit. A relation is expressed between life and death, and, by antithesis, the one dies and the other lives.

We learn the same thing from Solomon, when describing man's death, he makes a wide difference between the soul and the body. He says, (Eccl. xii. 7,) "Until the dust return to the earth whence it was, and the spirit return to God who gave it." I am aware that they are little affected by this argument, because they say that life returns to God, who is the fountain of life; and this is all. But the words themselves proclaim that in this way violence is done to them, and it is therefore needless to refute a silly quibble, which is unworthy of being either heard or read. Even this must imply, according to them, that souls return to the fountain of life only by a dream! Corresponding to this is a passage in Esdras, a writer whom I would not oppose to them did they not greatly lean upon him. Let them then hear their own Esdras, (4 Esdras iii. 2,) "The earth will render up those things which sleep in it, and dwell in silence; and the storehouses will render up the souls which were committed to them." They triflingly allege that the "storehouses" are *Divine Providence*, and that "souls" are *thoughts*, so that the Book of Life is to exhibit thoughts in the presence of God. They evidently speak thus, merely because they are ashamed to be silent, and have nothing better to say. But if we may turn about the Scriptures in this way, everything may be perverted! Here, however, though I have ample supplies, I will not produce anything of my own, since the writer defends himself from this misinterpretation. A little before he had said, (Esdras iv. 3,) "Did not the souls of these petition in their abodes, saying, How long do we hope this, O Lord? When will the harvest of our reward come?" What are these souls which petition and hope? Here, if they would escape, they must dig another burrow for themselves!

Let us come now to the history of the rich man and Lazarus, the latter of whom, after all the labours and toils of his mortal life are past, is at length carried into Abraham's bosom, while the former, having had his comforts here, now suffers torments. A great gulf is interposed between the joys of the one and the sufferings of the other. Are

these mere dreams—the gates of ivory which the poets fable? To secure a means of escape, they make the history a parable, and say, that all which truth speaks concerning Abraham, the rich man and the poor man, is fiction. Such reverence do they pay to God and his word! Let them produce even one passage from Scripture where any one is called by name in a parable! What is meant by the words —"There was a poor man named Lazarus?" Either the Word of God must lie, or it is a true narrative.

This is observed by the ancient expounders of Scripture. Ambrose says—It is a narrative rather than a parable, inasmuch as the name is added. Gregory takes the same view. Certainly Tertullian, Irenæus, Origen, Cyprian and Jerome, speak of it as a history. Among these, Tertullian thinks that, in the person of the rich man, Herod is designated, and in Lazarus John Baptist. The words of Irenæus are—"The Lord did not tell us a fable in the case of the rich man and Lazarus," &c. And Cyril, in replying to the Arians, who drew from it an argument against the Divinity of Christ, does not relate it as a parable, but expounds it as a history. (Tertull. lib. adv. Marcion; Iren. lib. iv. contra haeres. cap. iv.; Origen, Hom. v. in Ezech.; Cyprian epist. iii.; Hieron. in Jes. c. xlix. and lxv.; Hilar. in Psalm iii.; Cyril in John i. c. 22.) They are more absurd when they bring forward the name of Augustine, pretending that he held their view. They affirm this, I presume, because in one place he says—"In the parable, by Lazarus is to be understood Christ, and by the rich man the Pharisees;" when all he means is, that the narrative is converted into a parable if the person of Lazarus is assigned to Christ, and that of the rich man to the Pharisees. (August. de Genes. ad Liter. lib. viii.) This is the usual custom with those who take up a violent prejudice in favour of an opinion. Seeing that they have no ground to stand upon, they lay hold not only of syllables but letters to twist them to their use! To prevent them from insisting here, the writer himself elsewhere declares, that he understands it to be a history. Let them now go and try to put out the light of day by means of their smoke!

They cannot escape without always falling into the same net: for though we should grant it to be a parable, (this they cannot at all prove,) what more can they make of it than just that there is a comparison which must be founded in truth? If these great theologians do not know this, let them learn it from their grammars, there they will find that a parable is a similitude founded on reality. Thus, when it is said that a certain man had two sons to whom he divided his goods, there must be in the nature of things both a man and sons, inheritance and goods. In short, the invariable rule in parables is, that we first conceive a simple subject and set it forth; then, from that conception, we are guided to the scope of the parable—in other words, to the thing itself to which it is accommodated. Let them imitate Chrysostom, who is their Achilles in this matter. He thought that it was a parable, though he often extracts a reality from it, as when he proves from it that the dead have certain abodes, and shews the dreadful nature of Gehenna, and the destructive effects of luxury. (Chrysos. Hom. xxv. in Matt. Hom. lvii.; *in eundem*, In Par ad The. Lapsor. Hom. iv. Matt.) Not to lose many words here, let them consult common sense, if they have any, and they will easily perceive the nature and force of the parable.

Feeling desirous, as far as we can, to satisfy all, we will here say something respecting THE REST OF THE SOUL WHEN, IN SURE TRUST IN THE DIVINE PROMISE, IT IS FREED FROM THE BODY. Scripture, by the bosom of Abraham, only means to designate this rest. *First*, we give the name of "rest" to that which our opponents call "sleep." We have no aversion, indeed, to the term *sleep*, were it not corrupted and almost polluted by their falsehoods. *Secondly*, by "rest" we understand, not sloth, or lethargy, or anything like the drowsiness of ebriety which they attribute to the soul; but tranquillity of conscience and security, which always accompanies faith, but is never complete in all its parts till after death.

The Church, indeed, while still dwelling on the earth as a stranger, learns the blessedness of believers from the lips of the Lord, (Isaiah xxxii. 18,) "My people will walk in the

beauty of peace, and in the tents of trust, and in rich rest." She herself, on the other hand, giving thanks, sings to the Lord while blessing her, (Isaiah xxvi. 12,) "O Lord, thou wilt give us peace: for thou hast performed all our works for us." Believers have this PEACE on receiving the gospel, when they see that God, whom they dreaded as their Judge, has become their Father; themselves, instead of children of wrath, children of grace; and the bowels of the divine mercy poured out toward them, so that now they expect from God nothing but goodness and mildness. But since human life on earth is a warfare, (Job vii. 1,) those who feel both the stings of sin and the remains of the flesh, must feel depression in the world, though with consolation in God—such consolation, however, as does not leave the mind perfectly calm and undisturbed. But when they shall be divested of flesh and the desires of the flesh, (which, like domestic enemies, break their peace,) then at length will they rest and recline with God: For thus speaks the Prophet, "The just perisheth, and no man layeth it to heart; and men of mercy are gathered: for the just is gathered from the face of wickedness. Let peace come, let him who hath walked under his direction rest in his bed." (Isaiah lvii. 1.) Does he not call those to peace who had been the sons of peace? Still, as their peace was with God, and they had war in the world, he calls them to a higher degree of peace.

Accordingly, Ezekiel and John, when they would describe the throne of God's glory, encircle it with a rainbow, which we know to be the sign of the covenant between God and men. This John has taught more clearly in another passage, "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord, yea, says the Scripture, that they may rest from their labours." (Ezek. i. 28; Rev. ix. 3; xiv. 13.) This, then, is the bosom of Abraham: for it was he himself who, with ready mind, embraced the promises made to his own seed, never doubting that the word of God was efficacious and true: and as if God had actually performed what he had promised, he waited for that blessed seed with no less assurance than if he had had it in his hands, and perceived it with all his senses. Accordingly, our Lord bore this testimony to him, that "he saw His day

and was glad." (John viii. 56.) Here is the peace of Abraham, here his rest, here his sleep; only let not an honourable name be polluted by the lips of these dull sleepers: for in what can conscience rest more pleasantly than in this peace, which opens to it the treasures of heavenly grace and intoxicates it with the sweetness of the Lord's cup? Why, O sleepers! when you hear of intoxication, do you not think of vertigo, of heaviness, of your gross carnal sleep? Such are the inconveniences which ensue upon intoxication! Such may be your gross imaginations; but those who are taught of God understand that "sleep" is used, in this way, for the peace of conscience which the Lord bestows upon his followers in the abode of peace, and "intoxication" for the riches with which God satisfies his people in the abode of opulence. If Abraham possessed this peace when exposed to inroads from his enemies, to labours and dangers, nay, when bearing about with him his flesh, a domestic enemy than whom there is none more pernicious, how great must his peace be now that he has escaped from all hostile blows and darts?

No one can now wonder why the elect of God are said to "rest in the bosom of Abraham," when they have passed from this life to their God! It is just because they are admitted with Abraham, the father of the faithful, where they enjoy God fully without weariness. Wherefore, not without reason, Augustine says in a certain place, "As we call eternal life, so we may also call PEACE 'The end of the blessed:' for He can give nothing better who can give nothing greater or better than himself, being THE GOD OF PEACE." (August. de Civit. lib. 19.)

Henceforth, when the "bosom of Abraham" is spoken of, let them not wrest it to their dream, since the truth of Scripture at once establishes and condemns their vanity. There is, I say, a rest, a heavenly Jerusalem, *i.e.*, a vision of peace, in which the God of peace gives himself to be seen by his peace-makers, according to the promise of Christ. How often does the Spirit make mention of this *peace* in Scripture, and use the figure of "sleeping" and "resting" so familiarly, that the use of no figure is more frequent! "Thy

saints," says David, "will exult, they will rejoice in their beds." (Psalm cxlix. 5; Isaiah lvii. 2.) Another says, "Thy dead shall live, thy slain shall rise again. Awake, and praise, ye dwellers in the dust, because thy dew is the dew of meadows, and thou shalt bring the land of giants to destruction." "Go, my people, enter into thy tabernacles, shut thy doors upon thee, hide thyself for a little, until the indignation be overpast." (1 Cor. xv. 12; 1 Thess. v. 13; Matt. v. 8, 9; Isaiah xxvi. 19.) Nay, the Hebrew tongue uses the word to signify any security and confidence. David, on the other hand, says, "I will sleep, and rest in peace." (Psalm iv. 9.) And the Prophet says, "I will make a covenant, in that day, with the beast of the field, and with the bird of the air, and with the reptile of the earth; I will break the bow and the sword, and banish war from the earth, and make them to sleep without terror." (Hos. ii. 18.) And Moses says, "I will give peace in your borders, and not one shall be afraid." (Lev. xxvi. 6.) And in the book of Job it is said, "Thou shalt have confidence in the hope set before thee, and buried wilt sleep secure. Thou shalt rest, and there will be none to terrify thee, and very many will supplicate thy face." (Job xi. 18, 19.)

Of the same thing we are admonished by the Latin proverb, of "sleeping on both ears," meaning to live securely. The souls of the living, therefore, who rest in the word of the Lord, and desire not to anticipate the will of their God, but are ready to follow wherever he may invite, keep themselves under his hand, sleep, and have peace. The command given to them is, "If His truth tarry, wait for it." (Hab. ii. 3.) And again, "In hope and silence will be your strength." (Isaiah xxx. 15.) Now, when they wait for something which they see not, and desire what they have not, it is evident that their peace is imperfect. On the other hand, while they confidently expect what they do expect, and in faith desire what they desire, it is clear that their desire is tranquil. This peace is increased and advanced by death, which, freeing, and as it were discharging them from the warfare of this world, leads them into the place of peace, where, while wholly intent on beholding God, they have nothing better to which they can turn their eyes or direct

their desire. Still, something is wanting which they desire to see, namely, the complete and perfect glory of God, to which they always aspire. Though there is no impatience in their desire, their rest is not yet full and perfect, since he is said to rest who is where he desires to be; and the measure of desire has no end till it has arrived where it was tending. But if the eyes of the elect look to the supreme glory of God as their final good, their desire is always moving onward till the glory of God is complete, and this completion awaits the judgment day. Then will be verified the saying, "I will be satisfied, when I awake, with beholding thy countenance." (Psalm xvii. 15.)

Not to omit the reprobate, whose doom need not give us great concern, I would like our opponents candidly to tell me, On what ground they have any hope of RESURRECTION, unless it be because Christ rose? He is the first-begotten of the dead, and the first-fruits of them that rise again. As he died and rose again, so do we also die and rise again. For if the death to which we were liable was to be overcome by death, he undoubtedly suffered the same death as we do, and likewise in death suffered what we suffer. Scripture makes this plain when it calls him the first-begotten of the dead, and the first-fruits of them that rise again. (Col. i. 18.) And it thus teaches, that believers in the midst of death acknowledge him as their leader, and while they behold their death sanctified by his death, have no dread of its curse. This Paul intimates when he says, that he was made conformable to his death, until he should attain to the resurrection of the dead. (Phil. ii. 20.) This conformity, here begun by the cross, He followed out until He should complete it by death.

Now, O dreamy sleepers, commune with your own hearts, and consider how Christ died. Did He sleep when he was working for your salvation? Not thus does he say of himself, "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." (John v. 26.) How could he who has life in himself lose it?

Let them not tell me that these things belong to his Divi-

nity. For if there has been given to him who has not, it has been given to man and not to God to have life in himself. For seeing that Jesus Christ is Son of God and man, that which he is by nature as God is he also by grace as man, that thus we may all receive of his fulness, and grace for grace. When men hear that there is life with God, what hope can they conceive from it, while they at the same time know that by their sins a cloud is interposed between them and God? But it is surely great consolation to know that God the Father has anointed Christ with the oil of joy above his fellows—that the man Christ has received from the Father gifts for men, so that we may be able to find life in our nature. Hence we read that the multitude, after the boy was raised, glorified God who had given such power to men. (Acts xx. 12.) This was certainly seen by Cyril, who agrees with us in the exposition of this passage. But when we say that Christ, as man, has life in himself, we do not say that he is the cause of life to himself.

This may be made plain from a familiar comparison. A fountain from which all drink, and from which streams flow and are derived, is said to have water in itself; and yet it has it not of itself but of the source, which constantly supplies what may suffice both for the running streams and the men who drink of it. Accordingly, Christ has life in himself, *i.e.*, fulness of life, by which he both himself lives and quickens others; yet he has it not of himself, as he elsewhere declares that he lives by the Father. And though as God he had life in himself, yet when he assumed human nature, he received from the Father the gift of having life in himself in that nature also. These things give us the fullest assurance that Christ could not be extinguished by death, even in respect of his human nature; and that although he was truly and naturally delivered to the death which we all undergo, he, however, always retained the gift of the Father. True! death was a separation of soul and body. But the soul never lost its life. Having been commended to the Father it could not but be safe.

This is intimated by the words in Peter's sermon, in which he affirms that it was impossible he could be holden of death,

in order that the Scripture might be fulfilled, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, nor allow thy Holy One to see corruption." (Acts ii. 27.) Though we should grant that in this prophecy "soul" is used for *life*, Christ asks and expects two things of his Father—not to abandon his soul to perdition, nor allow himself to be subjected to corruption. This was fulfilled. For his soul was supported by divine power, and did not fall into perdition, and the body was preserved in the tomb till its Resurrection. All these things Peter embraced in one expression, when he says that Christ could not be held of death κρατεῖσθαι, *i.e.*, yield to the domination, or fall under the power of death, or continue to be seized by it. It is true that Peter, in that discourse, leaving off the consideration of the soul, continues to speak of the incorruption of the body only. This he does to convince the Jews, on the authority of their own writers, that this prophecy did not apply to David, whose sepulchre was extant among them, whose body they knew to have fallen under corruption, so that they could not deny the resurrection of our Lord. Another proof of the immortality of his soul was given us by our Saviour, when he made the confinement of Jonah three days within the whale's belly to be a type of his death, stating that thus He would be three days and three nights in the belly of the earth. But Jonah cried unto the Lord from the belly of the fish, and was heard. That belly is death. He therefore had his soul safe in death, and by means of it could cry unto the Lord.

Isaac, also, who was a type of Christ, and was restored to his father from death, by a kind of type of the resurrection, as the Apostle says, shews us the truth in a figure. For after having been bound, and placed upon the altar as a prepared victim, he was loosed by the order of God. But the ram which had been caught in the thicket was substituted for Isaac. And why is it that Isaac does not die, but just because Christ has given immortality to that which is peculiar to man—I mean the soul? But the ram, the irrational animal which is given up to death in his stead, is the body. In the binding of Isaac is represented the soul, which shewed only a semblance of dying in the death of Christ,

and the same is daily exhibited in ordinary instances of death. But as the soul of Christ was set free from prison, so our souls also are set free before they perish. Let any one of you now put on a supercilious air, and pretend that the death of Christ was a sleep—or let him go over and join the camp of Apollinaris! Christ was indeed awake when he exerted himself for your salvation; but you sleep your sleep, and, buried in the darkness of blindness, give no heed to his wakening calls!

Besides, it not only consoles us to think that Christ, our Head, did not perish in the shadow of death, but we have the additional security of his Resurrection, by which he constituted himself the Lord of death, and raised all of us who have any part in him above death, so that Paul did not hesitate to say, that "our life is hid with Christ in God." (Col. iii. 3.) Elsewhere he says, "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." (Gal. ii. 20.) What remains for our opponents but to cry with open mouth that Christ sleeps in sleeping souls? For if Christ lives in them he also dies in them. If, therefore, the life of Christ is ours, let him who insists that our life is ended by death, pull Christ down from the right hand of the Father and consign him to the second death. If He can die, our death is certain; if he has no end of life, neither can our souls ingrafted in him be ended by any death!

But why labour the point? Is there any obscurity in the words, "Because I live, ye shall live also?" (John xiv. 19.) If we live because he lives, then if we die he does not live. Is there any obscurity in his promise, that he will remain in all who are united to him by faith, and they in him? (John vi. 56.) Therefore, if we would deprive the members of life, let us dissever them from Christ. Our confession, which is sufficiently established, is this, "In Adam all die, but in Christ are made alive." (1 Cor. xv. 22.) These things are splendidly and magnificently handled by Paul. (Rom. viii. 10.) "If the Spirit of Christ dwell in us, the body is dead because of sin, but the Spirit is life because of righteousness." He no doubt calls the body the mass of sin, which resides in man from the native property of the

flesh; and the spirit the part of man spiritually regenerated. Wherefore, when a little before he deplored his wretchedness because of the remains of sin adhering to him, (Rom. vii. 24,) he did not desire to be taken away altogether, or to be nothing, in order that he might escape from that misery, but to be freed from the body of death, *i.e.*, that the mass of sin in him might die, that the spirit, being purged, and, as it were, freed from dregs, he might have peace with God through this very circumstance; declaring, that his better part was held captive by bodily chains and would be freed by death.

I wish we could with true faith perceive of what nature the kingdom of God is which exists in believers, even while they are in this life. For it would at the same time be easy to understand that eternal life is begun. He who cannot deceive promised thus:—"Whoso hears my words has eternal life, and does not come into condemnation, but hath passed from death unto life." (John v. 24.) If an entrance has been given into eternal life, why do they interrupt it by death? Elsewhere he says, "This is the work of the Father, that every one who believes in the Son may not perish, but have eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." (John vi. 40.) Again, "He who eats my flesh, and drinks my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. Not as your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead. He who eateth of this bread shall live for ever." (John vi. 54.)

Do not attempt here to introduce your fictitious comments concerning The Last Day. He promises us two things—Eternal life, and the Resurrection. Though you are told of two you admit only one! Another expression of Christ is still more decisive. He says, "I am the resurrection and the life. He who believeth on me shall live though he were dead. And whoso liveth and believeth in me shall not die for ever." (John xi. 25, 26.) It will not do to say, that those who are raised do not die for ever. Our Lord meant not only this, but that it is impossible they can ever die. This meaning is better expressed by the Greek words *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, equivalent in Latin to *in seculum:* for when we say

that a thing will not be *in seculum*, we affirm that it will never be at all. Thus in another passage, "Whoso will keep my word shall not see death for ever." (John viii. 51.) This invincibly proves, that he who will keep the word of the Lord shall not see death; and it should be sufficient to arm the faith of Christians against the perverseness of these men. This is our belief, this our expectation. Meanwhile, what remains for them but to continue sleeping on till they are awakened by the clang of the trumpet which shall break their slumbers like a thief in the night?

And if God is the life of the soul, just as the soul is the life of the body, how can it be that the soul keeps acting upon the body so long as it is in the body, and never is for an instant idle, and yet that God should cease from acting as if He were fatigued! If such is the vigour of the soul in sustaining, moving, and impelling a lump of clay, how great must be the energy of God in moving and actuating the soul to which agility is natural! Some go the length of saying, that the soul becomes evanescent; others, that its vigour is not exercised after the fetters of the body are dissolved. What answer then will they give to David's hymn, (Psalm lxxiii.,) wherein he describes the beginning, middle, and end of the life of the blessed? He says, "They will go from strength to strength; the Lord of hosts will be seen in Zion;" or, as the Hebrew has it, from abundance to abundance. If they always increase till they see God, and pass from that increase to the vision of God, on what ground do these men bury them in drunken slumber and deep sloth?

The same thing is testified still more clearly by the Apostle when he says, that if they are dissolved they are no longer able to resist the Spirit of God. His words are, "We know that if the earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven; if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we who are in this tabernacle do groan being burdened, not because we wish to be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality may be swallowed up of life." (2 Cor.

v. 1-3.) A little afterwards he says, "Therefore we are always of good courage, and know that while we are at home in the body we are absent from the Lord; (for we walk by faith, not by sight;) we are confident, and would rather be absent from the body and present with the Lord." (2 Cor. v. 6-8.)

Here the evasion they have recourse to is, that the Apostle's words refer to The Day of Judgment, when both we shall be clothed upon, and mortality shall be swallowed up of life. Accordingly, they say, the Apostle includes both in one paragraph, "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ." (2 Cor. v. 10.) But why do they refer this clothing upon to the body, rather than to spiritual blessings with which we are richly supplied at death? What forces them to interpret the life there spoken of as meaning *resurrection?* The simple and obvious meaning of the Apostle is, We desire indeed to depart from this prison of the body, but not to wander uncertain without a home: There is a better home which the Lord hath prepared for us; clothed with it, we shall not be found naked. Christ is our clothing, and our armour is that which the Apostle puts upon us. (Eph. vi. 11.) And it is written, (Psalm xlv. 13,) "The king will admire the beauty of his spouse, who will be richly provided with gifts, and all glorious within." In fine, the Lord has put a seal upon his own people, whom he will acknowledge both at death and at the resurrection. (Rev. vii.) Why do they not rather look back to what he had just said in the previous context, with which he connects this very sentence? "Though our outward man decays, our inward man is renewed day by day." (2 Cor. iv. 16.) They find it more difficult to evade what the Apostle subjoins as to our appearance before the judgment-seat of Christ, after having said, that whether at home or living abroad we labour to please him. Since by *home* he means the body, what are we to understand by this *living abroad?*

Therefore, though we were not to add one word, the meaning is obvious without an interpreter. It is, that both in the body and out of the body we labour to please the Lord; and that we shall perceive the presence of God when we

shall be separated from this body—that we will no longer walk by faith but by sight, since the load of clay by which we are pressed down, acts as a kind of wall of partition, keeping us far away from God. Those triflers, on the contrary, absurdly pretend that at death we are to be more widely separated from God than we are during life! In regard even to the present life, it is said of the righteous, "They shall walk, O Lord, in the light of thy countenance," (Psalm lxxxviii.;) and again, "The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God," (Rom. viii. 16;) besides many other passages to the same effect. But these men deprive the righteous at death both of the light of God's countenance and the witness of his Spirit; and, therefore, if they are correct, we are happier now than we are to be at death! For, as Paul says, (Phil. iii.,) even while we live under the elements of this world, we have a habitation and citizenship in the heavens. But if, as they maintain, our souls are at death overwhelmed with lethargy, and buried in oblivion, they must lose every kind of spiritual enjoyment which they previously possessed.

We are better taught by the Sacred Writings. The body, which decays, weighs down the soul, and confining it within an earthly habitation, greatly limits its perceptions. If the body is the prison of the soul, if the earthly habitation is a kind of fetters, what is the state of the soul when set free from this prison, when loosed from these fetters? Is it not restored to itself, and as it were made complete, so that we may truly say, that all which it gains is so much lost to the body? Whether they will or not, they must be forced to confess, that when we put off the load of the body, the war between the spirit and the flesh ceases. In short, the mortification of the flesh is the quickening of the spirit. Then the soul, set free from impurities, is truly spiritual, so as to be in accordance with the will of God, and not subject to the tyranny of the flesh, rebelling against it. In short, the mortification of the flesh will be the quickening of the spirit: For then the soul, having shaken off all kinds of pollution, is truly spiritual, so that it consents to the will of God, and is no longer subjected to the tyranny of the flesh; thus dwelling

in tranquillity, with all its thoughts fixed on God. Are we to say that it sleeps, when it can rise aloft unencumbered with any load?—that it slumbers, when it can perceive many things by sense and thought, no obstacle preventing? These things not only manifest the errors of these men, but also their malignant hostility to the works and operations which the Scriptures proclaim that God performs in his saints.

We acknowledge God as growing in his elect, and increasing from day to day. This the wise man teaches us, when he says, (Prov. iv. 18,) "The path of the just is as the light, increasing into the perfect day." And the Apostle affirms, that "He who has begun a good work in you will perfect it against the day of the Lord Jesus." (Phil. i. 6.) These men not only intermit the work of God for a time, but even extinguish it. Those who formerly went from faith to faith, from virtue to virtue, and enjoyed a foretaste of blessedness when they exercised themselves in thinking of God, they deprive both of faith and virtue, and all thought of God, and merely place on beds, in a sluggish and lethargic state! For how do they interpret that progress? Do they think that souls are perfected when they are made heavy with sleep as a preparation for their being brought sleek and fat into the presence of God when he shall sit in judgment? Had they a particle of sense they would not prattle thus absurdly about the soul, but would make all the difference between a celestial soul and an earthly body, that there is between heaven and earth. When the Apostle longs to depart and to be with Christ, (Phil. i. 23,) do they think he wishes to fall asleep so as no longer to feel any desire of Christ? Was this all he was longing for when he said he knew he had a building of God, an house not made with hands, as soon as the earthly house of his tabernacle should be dissolved? (2 Cor. v. 1.) Where were the benefit of being with Christ were he to cease to live the life of Christ?

What! are they not overawed by the words of the Lord when, calling himself the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, he says, he is "God not of the dead but of the living?" (Matt. xxii. 32.) Is He, then, neither to be to them a God, nor are they to be to him a people? (Mark xii. 27.) But

they say that these things will be realized when the dead shall be raised to life. Although the question expressly asked is, Have you not read what was said concerning the Resurrection of the dead? this evasion will not serve their purpose. Christ having to do with the Sadducees, who denied not only the Resurrection of the dead but the immortality of the soul, convicts them of two errors by this single expression. For if God is God not of the dead but of the living, and Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had departed this life when God spoke to Moses calling himself their God, the inference is, that they were living another life. Those must surely be in being of whom God says that he is their God. Hence Luke adds, "For all things live to him," (Luke xxx. 28,) not meaning that all things live by the presence of God, but by his energy. It follows, therefore, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are alive. To this passage we add that of the Apostle, (Rom. xiv. 8, 9,) "Whether we live, we live unto the Lord, whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live or die, we are the Lord's. For, for this Christ both died and rose again, that he might be Lord of the living and the dead." What more solid foundation could there be on which to rear our faith, than to say that Christ rules over the dead? There can only be rule over persons who exist, the exercise of government necessarily implying the existence of subjects.

Testimony is also borne against them in heaven before God and his angels, by the souls of the martyrs under the altar, who with loud voice cry, "How long, O Lord, dost thou not avenge our blood on those who dwell on the earth? And there were given unto them white robes, and it was told them still to rest for a season, until the number of their fellow-servants and their brethren who were to be slain like them should be completed." (Rev. vi. 10, 11.) The souls of the dead cry aloud, and white robes are given unto them! O sleeping spirits! what are white robes to you? Are they pillows on which you are to lie down and sleep? You see that white robes are not at all adapted for sleep, and therefore, when thus clothed, they must be awake. If this is true, these white robes undoubtedly designate the commencement

of glory, which the Divine liberality bestows upon martyrs while waiting for the day of judgment.

It is no new thing for Scripture to designate glory, festivity, and joy, under the figure of a white robe. It was in a white robe the Lord appeared in vision to Daniel. In this garb the Lord was seen on Mount Tabor. The angel of the Lord appeared to the women at the sepulchre in white raiment; and under the same form did the angels appear to the disciples as they continued gazing up to heaven after their Lord's ascension. In the same, too, did the angel appear to Cornelius, and when the son who had wasted his substance had returned to his father, he was clothed in the best robe, as a symbol of joy and festivity. (Dan. vii. 9; Matt. xvii. 2; xxviii. 3; Mark xvi. 5; Acts i. 10; x. 30; Luke xv. 22.)

Again, If the souls of the dead cried aloud, they were not sleeping. When, then, did that drowsiness overtake them? Let no one here obtrude the expression that "the blood of Abel *cried* for vengeance!" I am perfectly ready to admit that when blood has been shed, it is an ordinary figure to represent it as calling aloud for vengeance. In this passage, however, it is certain that the feeling of the martyrs is represented to us by crying, because their desire is expressed and their petition described without any figure, "How long, O Lord, dost thou not avenge?" &c. Accordingly, in the same book John has described a twofold Resurrection as well as a twofold death; namely, one of the soul before judgment, and another when the body will be raised up, and when the soul also will be raised up to glory. "Blessed," says he, "are those who have part in the first Resurrection; on them the second death takes no effect." (Rev. xx. 6.) Well, then, may you be afraid who refuse to acknowledge that first Resurrection, which, however, is the only entrance to beatific glory.

One of the most fatal blows to the dogma of these men is the answer which was given to the thief who implored mercy. He prayed, "Lord, remember me when thou comest to thy kingdom;" and he hears the reply, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." (Luke xxiii. 43.) He who is every-

where, promises that he will be present with the thief. And he promises paradise, because he who thus enjoys God has fulness of delight. Nor does he put him off for a long series of days. He calls him to the joys of his kingdom on that very day! They endeavour to evade the force of our Saviour's expression by a paltry quibble. They say, "One day is with him as a thousand years." (2 Peter iii. 8.) But they remember not that God in speaking to man, accommodates himself to human sense. They are not told that in Scripture one day is used for a thousand years. Who would listen to the expounder, who, on being told that God would do something to-day, should immediately explain it as meaning thousands of years? When Jonah declared to the Ninevites, "Forty days and Nineveh shall be destroyed," (Jonah iii. 4,) might they have waited securely for the future judgment, as not to be inflicted till forty thousand years should have elapsed? It was not in this sense Peter said, that in the sight of God a thousand years were as one day; but when some false prophets counted days and hours for the purpose of charging God with falsehood in not fulfilling His promises, the moment they wished for it, he reminds them that with God is eternity, compared with which a thousand years are scarcely a single moment.

Feeling themselves completely entangled, they maintain that in Scripture *To-day* means the duration of the New, and *Yesterday* the duration of the Old Testament! To this meaning they wrest the passage, (Heb. xiii. 8,) "Jesus Christ, yesterday, and to-day, the same for ever." Here they are totally in error. For, if he was only *Yesterday*, then not being before the commencement of the Old Testament, he might at one time have begun to be! Where then will be Jesus, the eternal God, in respect of humanity, even the first-born of every creature, and the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world? (Col. i. 15; Rev. xiii. 8.) Again, if *To-day* means the time which intervenes between the incarnation of Christ and the day of judgment, we hold that paradise will be enjoyed by the thief previous to the period at which they say that souls are awakened out of sleep! Thus, then, they will be forced to confess that the promise given to the

thief was fulfilled before the judgment, though they at the same time insist that it was not to be fulfilled till after the judgment. But if they confine the expression to the time which follows the judgment, why does the author of the Epistle add "*For ever?*" And to make their darkness visible, if Christ referred in that promise to the period of judgment, he ought not to have said, *To-day*, but at a future age; just as Isaiah, when he wished to express the mystery of the Resurrection, called Christ "the Father of the future age." (Isaiah ix. 6.)

But since the Apostle used the expression, "Yesterday, to-day, and for ever," for what we are accustomed to express by "Was, is, and shall be"—the three tenses being with us equivalent to eternity—what more do they by their quibble than pervert the Apostle's meaning? That the term *Yesterday* is used to comprehend an eternal duration may be distinctly learned from the Prophet, who writes, (Isaiah xxx. 33,) "Tophet has been ordained for the wicked from the time of yesterday," while we know from the words of Christ that fire has been prepared from eternity for the devil and his angels. (Matt. xxv. 41.) All of them who have any judgment or sound mind, here see that they have no means left by which they can elude the truth made thus manifest. Still, however, they continue to cavil and say, that paradise was promised to the thief on that day, just as death was denounced to our first parents on the day on which they should taste of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Were we to grant this, we can still force them to admit that the robber on that day was restored from the misery into which Adam fell on the day on which he transgressed the law that had been laid upon him. Moreover, when I shall by and bye discourse of death, I shall make it abundantly plain, if I mistake not, how our parents did die on the day on which they rebelled against God.

Let me now direct my discourse to those who with a pure conscience, remembering the promises of God, acquiesce in them. Brethren, let no man rob you of this faith, though all the gates of hell should resist, since you have the assur-

ance of God, who cannot deny his truth! There is not the least obscurity in his language to the Church, while still a pilgrim on the earth: "You shall no more have the sun to shine by day, nor shall the moon illumine you by her brightness, for the Lord shall be your everlasting light." (Isaiah lx. 19.) Here if they, after their usual custom, refer us to the last resurrection, it will be easy to refute the absurdity from individual expressions of the chapter, in which the Lord at one time promises his Messiah, and at another promises to admit the Gentiles to alliance, &c. Let us ever call to mind what the Spirit hath taught by the mouth of David, (Psalm xcii. 13,) "The just shall flourish like the palm-tree, he shall be multiplied like the cedar on Lebanon. Those who have been planted in the house of the Lord will flourish in the courts of our God, they will still bud forth in their old age, they will be fat and flourishing."

Be not alarmed because all the powers of nature are thought to fail at the very time when you hear of a budding and flourishing old age. Reflecting with yourselves on these things, let your souls, in unison with David's, exclaim, (Psalm ciii. 5,) "O my soul, bless the Lord, who satisfieth thy mouth with good: thy youth shall be renewed like the eagle's." Leave the rest to the Lord, who guards our entrance and our exit from this time forth even for evermore. He it is who sendeth the early and the latter rain upon his elect. Of him we have been told, "Our God is the God of salvation," and "to the Lord our God belong the issues of death." Christ expounded this goodness of the Father to us when he said, "Father, with regard to those whom thou hast given me, I will that where I am they also may be with me, that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me." (Ps. cxxi. 8; Joel ii. 23; Ps. lxviii. 20; John xvii. 24.)

The faith thus sustained by all prophecies, evangelical truth, and Christ himself, let us hold fast—the faith that our spirit is the image of God, like whom it lives, understands, and is eternal. As long as it is in the body it exerts its own powers; but when it quits this prison-house it returns to God, whose presence it meanwhile enjoys while it rests in the hope of a blessed Resurrection. This rest is its

paradise. On the other hand, the spirit of the reprobate, while it waits for the dreadful judgment, is tortured by that anticipation, which the Apostle for that reason calls φοβεράν, (fearful.) To inquire beyond this is to plunge into the abyss of the Divine mysteries. It is enough to have learned what the Spirit, our best Teacher, deemed it sufficient to have taught. His words are, "Hear me, and your soul shall live." (Isaiah lv. 3.) How wisely, in opposition to the vanity and arrogance of those men, was it said, "The souls of the righteous are in the hands of God, and the pangs of death will not touch them. To the eyes of the foolish they seemed to die, but they are in peace," &c. This is the end of our wisdom, which, while it is sober and subject to God, at the same time knows, that those who aspire higher only procure a fall.

Let us now examine the cradle in which they rock souls asleep, and let us dispose of the soporiferous draught which they give them to drink. They carry about with them some passages of Scripture which seem to favour that SLEEP, and then, as if the fact of *sleeping* were clearly proved, fulminate against those who do not instantly subscribe to their error.

They insist, *first*, That God did not infuse into man any other soul than that which is common to him with the brutes; for Scripture ascribes the same "living soul" to all alike; as where it is said, "God created the great whales and every living soul." (Gen. i. 21.) Again, "To each of all flesh in which was the breath of life," (Gen. vii. 15;) and other things to the same effect. And it is said, that even had the Sacred Writings elsewhere made no mention of the matter, we are distinctly reminded by the Apostle, (1 Cor. xv. 42,) that that living soul differs in no respect from the present life with which the body vegetates, when he says, "It is sown in corruption, it will rise in incorruption; it is sown in weakness, it will rise in power; it is sown an animal, it will rise a spiritual body; as it is written, The first Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam a quickening spirit."

I admit that a *living soul* is repeatedly attributed to the brutes, because they, too, have their own life; but they live

after one way, man after another. Man has a living soul by which he knows and understands; they have a living soul which gives their body sense and motion. Seeing, then, that the soul of man possesses reason, intellect, and will—qualities which are not annexed to the body—it is not wonderful that it subsists without the body, and does not perish like the brutes, which have nothing more than their bodily senses. Hence Paul was not ashamed to adopt the expression of a heathen poet, and call us the offspring of God. (Acts xvii. 28.) Let them, then, if they will, make a living soul common to man and to the brutes, since in so far as the body is concerned they have all the same life, but let them not employ this as an argument for confounding the soul of man with the brutes.

Nor let them obtrude upon me the Apostle's expression, which is more with me than against me. He says, "The first Adam was a living soul, the last Adam a quickening spirit." (1 Cor. xv. 45.) His answer here corresponds to the question of those who could not be persuaded of the Resurrection. They objected, How will the dead rise again? With what body will they come? The Apostle, to meet this objection, thus addresses them: If we learn by experience that the seed, which lives, grows, and yields fruit, has previously died, why may not the body after it has died rise again like a seed? And if dry and bare grain, after it has died, produces more abundant increase, by a wondrous virtue which God has implanted in it, why may not the body, by the same divine power, be raised better than it died? And that you may not wonder at this: How is it that man lives, but just because he was formed a living soul? This soul, however, though for a time it actuates and sustains the bodily mass, does not impart to it immortality or incorruption, and as long even as it exerts its own energy; it is not sufficient by itself, without the auxiliaries of food, drink, sleep, which are the signs of corruption; nor does it maintain it in a constant and uniform state without being subject to various kinds of inclinations. But when Christ shall have received us into his own glory, not only will the animal body be quickened by the soul, but made

spiritual in a manner which our mind can neither comprehend nor our tongue express. (See Tertullian and August., Ep. 3, ad Fortunat.) You see, then, that in the Resurrection we shall be not a *different thing*, but a *different person*, (pardon the expression.) These things have been said of the body, to which the soul ministers life under the elements of this world; but when the fashion of this world shall have passed away, participation in the glory of God will exalt it above nature.

We now have the genuine meaning of the Apostle's expression. Augustine, having once erred in expounding it, as those men now do, afterwards acknowledged his error, and inserted it among his Retractations. In another place he treats the whole subject with the greatest distinctness. (Retract., c. 10, Ep. 146, Consentio.) I will make a few extracts:—"The soul indeed lives in an animal body, but does not quicken it so as to take away corruption; but when, in a spiritual body, adhering perfectly to the Lord, one spirit is formed, it so quickens it as to make it a spiritual body, consuming all corruption, fearing no separation." In short, were I to grant them all they ask in regard to a living soul, (on which expression, as I have already said, I do not found much,) yet that seat of the image of God always remains safe, whether they call it "soul" or "spirit," or give it any other name.

It is not more difficult to refute their Objection taken from Ezekiel xxxvii. 9, where the Prophet, making a kind of supposititious Resurrection, calls a spirit from the four winds to breathe upon the dry bones. From this they think themselves entitled to infer, that the soul of man is nothing else than the power and faculty of motion without substance—a power and faculty which may become evanescent at death, and be again gathered together at the Resurrection. As if I might not in the same way infer that the Spirit of God is either wind or evanescent motion, seeing that Ezekiel himself, in his first vision, uses the term "wind" for the eternal Spirit of God! But to any man not altogether stupid it is easy to give the solution, though these good folks, from dulness or ignorance, observe it not. In both passages we see

examples of what is ever and anon occurring in the Prophets, who figure spiritual things too high for human sense by corporeal and visible symbols. Accordingly, when Ezekiel wished to give a distinct and, as it were, bodily representation of the Spirit of God and the spirit of man—a thing altogether impossible in regard to a spiritual nature—he borrowed a similitude from corporeal objects to serve as a kind of image.

Their *second* Objection is, That the Soul, though endowed with immortality, lapsed into sin, and thereby sunk and destroyed its immortality. This was the appointed punishment for sin as denounced to our first parents—"Dying ye shall die." (Gen. ii. 17.) And Paul says, "The wages of sin is death." (Rom. vi. 23.) And the Prophet exclaims, that "The soul that sinneth shall die." (Ezek. xviii. 4.) They quote other similar passages. But I ask, *first*, Whether the same wages of sin were not paid to the Devil?—and yet his death was not such as to prevent him from being always awake, going about seeking whom he may devour, and working in the children of disobedience. I ask, *secondly*, Whether or not there is to be any end to that death? If none, as we must certainly acknowledge, then, although dead, they shall still feel eternal fire and the worm which dieth not. These things make it manifest that the immortality of the soul, which we assert, and which we say consists in a perception of good and evil, exists even when it is dead, and that that death is something else than the annihilation to which they would reduce it.

Nor are the Scriptures silent on this point, could they bring their mind to submit their own views to Scripture, instead of arrogantly affirming whatever their dark and drowsy brains may dictate. When God pronounces this sentence against man as a sinner, "Dust thou art, and to dust shalt thou return," does he say more than that that which has been taken from the earth shall return to the earth? Whither then does the soul go? Does it descend into the tomb, to rottenness and corruption? These points will be considered more fully by and bye. But now, why do they quibble? We have heard that that which is of the

earth is to be returned to the earth. Why do we plunge the spirit of man under the earth? He says not that man will return to the earth, but that he who is dust will return to dust. But dust is that which was formed out of clay. It returns to dust, but not the spirit, which God derived from another quarter, and gave to man. Accordingly, we read in the book of Job, "Remember how thou hast made me of clay, and will reduce me to dust." (Job x. 9.) This is said of the body. A little after he adds, "Life and mercy hast thou given me, and thy visitation has preserved my spirit." (Job x. 12.) That life, then, was not to return to dust.

THE DEATH OF THE SOUL is very different. It is the judgment of God, the weight of which the wretched soul cannot bear without being wholly confounded, crushed, and desperate, as both the Scriptures teach us, and experience has taught those whom God has once smitten with his terrors. To begin with Adam, who first received the fatal wages, What do we think his feelings must have been when he heard the dreadful question, "Adam, where art thou?" It is easier to imagine than to express it, though imagination must fall far short of the reality. As the sublime majesty of God cannot be expressed in words, so neither can his dreadful anger on those on whom he inflicts it be expressed. They see the power of the Almighty actually present: to escape it, they would plunge themselves into a thousand abysses; but escape they cannot. Who does not confess that this is very death? Here I again say that they have no need of words who have at any time felt the stings of conscience; and let those who have not felt them only listen to the Scriptures, in which "our God" is described as "a consuming fire," and as slaying when he speaks in judgment. Such they knew him to be, who said, (Exod. xx. 19; Deut. xviii. 16,) "Let not the Lord speak to us, lest we die!"

Would you know what the death of the soul is? It is to be without God—to be abandoned by God, and left to itself: for if God is its life, it loses its life when it loses the presence of God. That which has been said in general may be shewn in particular parts. If without God, there are no

rays to illumine our night, surely the soul, buried in its own darkness, is *blind*. It is also *dumb*, not being able to confess unto salvation what it has believed unto righteousness. It is *deaf*, not hearing that living voice. It is *lame*, nay, unable to support itself, having none to whom it can say, "Thou hast held my right hand, and conducted me in thy will." In short, it performs no one function of life. For thus speaks the Prophet, when he would shew that the fountain of life is with God, (Baruch iii. 14)—"Learn where there is prudence, where there is virtue, where there is understanding, where there is length of life and food, where there is light to the eyes and peace."

What more do you require for death? But, not to stop here, let us consider with ourselves what life Christ hath brought us, and then we shall understand what the death is from which he hath redeemed us. We are taught both by the Apostle, when he says, "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ will give thee light." (Eph. v. 14.) Here it is not asses he addresses, but those who, entangled in sin, carry death and hell along with them. Again, "You, when you were dead in sins, hath he quickened together in Christ, forgiving you all trespasses." (Eph. ii. 1.) Accordingly, as the Apostle says, that "we die to sin," when concupiscence is extinguished in us, so we also die to God when we become subject to concupiscence living in us. (Col. ii. 13; Rom. vi. 2.) Nay, (to comprehend in one word what he says of the widow living in pleasure,) "while living we are dead;" in other words, we are undying in regard to death. (1 Tim. v. 6.) For although the mind retains its power of perception, yet evil concupiscence is, as it were, a kind of mental stupefaction.

Then, such death as the soul endures Christ underwent on our account; for all which the prophecies promised concerning his victory over death he performed by his death. The prophets declared, "He will overthrow death for ever." Again, "I will be thy death, O death! thy devourer, O hell!" (Isaiah xxv. 8; Hos. xiii. 14.) The Apostles proclaim the accomplishment of these things, "He hath indeed destroyed death, and illumined life by the gospel."

(Col. ii.) And again, "If, by the fault of one, death reigned by one, much more shall those who have received exuberance of grace reign through life in Christ." (Rom. v. 17.) Let them, if they can, resist these passages, which are not so much words as flashes of lightning!

When they say, what we indeed admit, that death is from Adam—death, however, not as they feign, but such as we have lately shewn to be applicable to the soul—we, on the other hand, say that life is from Christ, and this they cannot deny. The whole controversy turns on a comparison between Adam and Christ. They must necessarily concede to the Apostle not only that everything which had fallen in Adam is renewed in Christ, but inasmuch as the power of grace was stronger than that of sin, so much has Christ been more powerful in restoring than Adam in destroying: for he distinctly declares that the gift is not as the sin, but is much more exuberant, not indeed by including a greater number of individuals, but by bestowing richer blessings on those whom it includes. Let them say, if they will, that it was exuberant, not by giving more abundant life, but by effacing many sins, seeing that the one sin of Adam had plunged us into ruin. I ask no more.

Again, when he elsewhere says, that "the sting of death was sin," (1 Cor. xv. 56,) how can death longer sting us, when its sting has been blunted, nay, destroyed? The whole scope of several chapters in the Epistle to the Romans is to make it manifest that sin is completely abolished so as no longer to have dominion over believers. Then, if the strength of sin is the law, what else do they, when they slay those who live in Christ, than subject them to the curse of the law from which they had been delivered? Hence the Apostle confidently declares, (Rom. viii. 1,) that "there is now no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." On those whom the Apostle thus frees from all condemnation, they pronounce the severest of all sentences, "Dying, ye shall die!" Where is grace, if death still reigns among the elect of God? Sin, as the Apostle says, indeed reigned unto death, but grace reigns unto eternal life, and, overcoming sin, leaves no place

for death. Therefore, as death reigned on entering by Adam, so now life reigns by Jesus Christ. And we know that "Christ, being raised from the dead, dies no more: death shall no longer have dominion over him: For in that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he lives, he lives unto God." (Rom. vi. 9.)

Here we may see how they themselves give their heresy its deathblow! When they say that "death is the punishment of sin," they at the same time imply that man, if he had not fallen, would have been immortal. What he began to be, he once was not; and what he is by punishment, he is not by nature. Then the Apostle exclaims that sin is absorbed by grace, so that it can no longer have any power over the elect of God; and hence we conclude that the elect now are such as Adam was before his sin; and as he was created inexterminable, so now have those become who have been renewed by Christ to a better nature. There is nothing at variance with this in the Apostle's declaration, (1 Cor. xv. 54,) "The word shall be accomplished, (*fiet:*) death has been swallowed up in victory," since no man can deny that the term *fiet* (shall be done) is synonymous with *implebitur* (shall be fulfilled.) That shall be fulfilled in the body which has now been begun in the soul; or rather, that which has only been begun in the soul will be fulfilled both in the soul and the body: for this common death which we all undergo, as it were by a common necessity of nature, is rather to the elect a kind of passage to the highest degree of immortality, than either an evil or a punishment, and, as Augustine says, (De Discrimine Vitae Human. et Brut., c. 43,) is nothing else than the falling off of the flesh, which does not consume the things connected with it, but divides them, seeing it restores each to its original.

Their *third* Argument is, That those who have died are in many places said to SLEEP, as in the case of Stephen, "He fell asleep in the Lord;" again, "Our Lazarus sleepeth;" again, "Be not anxious about them who are asleep." (Acts vii. 60; John xi. 11; 1 Thess. iv. 13.) The same occurs so often in the books of Kings, that there is scarcely an expression which is more familiar. But the passage on which they

most strenuously insist is taken from the book of Job: "A tree has hope: if it is cut down it grows green again, and its branches bud forth, &c.; but when man has died and been laid bare and consumed, where is he? As when the waters of the sea recede, and the channel left empty becomes dry, so man when he has fallen asleep will not rise nor be awakened out of his sleep till the heavens be crushed." (Job xiv. 7-12.)

But if you hold that souls sleep because death is called sleeping, then the soul of Christ must have been seized with the same sleep: for David thus speaks in his name, (Psalm iii. 6,) "I laid me down and slept; I rose up, for the Lord sustained me." And he hears his enemies in insult exclaiming, (Psalm xli. 9,) "Will he who sleeps rise again?" But if, as has been more fully discussed, nothing so mean and abject is to be imagined in regard to the soul of Christ, no man can doubt that the Scripture referred merely to the external composition of the body, and described it as sleep from so appearing to man. The two expressions are used indiscriminately, "he slept with his fathers," "he was laid with his fathers"—although no man's soul is laid with the soul of his fathers when his body is carried to their tomb. In the same sense, I think this sleep is attributed to impious kings, in the books of Kings and Chronicles.

When you hear that the wicked man sleeps, do you think of a sleep of his soul? It cannot have a worse executioner to torment it than an evil conscience. How can there be sleep amid such anguish? "The wicked are like the tempestuous sea which cannot rest, and whose waves cast up mire and dirt. "There is no peace to the wicked, saith the Lord." (Isaiah lvii. 21.) And yet, when David wished to describe the bitterest pang of conscience, he says, (Psalm xiii. 4,) "Enlighten my eyes, lest I sleep the sleep of death." The jaws of hell yawn to engulf him, the power of sin tosses him about, and yet he sleeps, nay, sleeps just because he so suffers! Here, too, we must send those back to their rudiments who have not yet learned that by synecdoche the whole is sometimes taken for a part, and sometimes a part for the whole—a figure which is constantly occurring in Scripture. I do

not wish the fact to be taken on my word, but will produce passages to prove it. When Job said, "Behold I now sleep in the dust, and if ye seek me in the morning I shall not subsist," (Job vii. 21,) did he think that his soul was to be overwhelmed with sleep? His soul was not to be thrown into the dust, and therefore was not to sleep in the dust. When he said in another passage, "And yet they shall sleep in the dust, and the worms shall cover them," (Job xxi. 26;) and when David said, "Like the wounded sleeping in their tombs," (Psalm lxxxviii. 6,) do you think that they put souls down before worms to be gnawed by them?

To the same effect the Prophet, when describing the future destruction of Nebuchadnezzar says, "The whole land has rested and been silent, the fir-trees also and the cedars of Lebanon have rejoiced over thee; from the time at which thou didst fall asleep, no one has come up to hew us down." (Isaiah xiv. 8.) A little after he says, "All the kings of the nations have slept in glory, each man in his place, but thou hast been cast forth from the tomb." (Isaiah xiv. 18, 19.) All these things were said of a dead body, "*sleeping*," being used as equivalent to lying or being stretched out, as sleepers do when stretched on the ground. This mode of expression might be taught us by profane writers, one of whom says, "When once our short light has set, an everlasting night must be slept;" and another, "Fool, what is sleep?" and again, "Let the bones of Naso lie softly." These expressions are used by writers who have many monstrous fictions respecting the lower regions, and describe the many and various feelings by which the shades of the dead are affected. Hence the very name given by the ancients to places destined for sepulture was κοιμητηριον, ("cemetery," or "sleeping-place.") They did not imagine that dead souls were then laid to rest, but spoke only of the body. I presume that I have now sufficiently disposed of the smoke in which they involved their "Sleep of the Soul," by proving that nowhere in Scripture is the term sleep applied to the soul, when it is used to designate death. We have elsewhere discoursed fully of "The Rest of the Soul."

The *fourth* Argument which they urge against us, as their

most powerful battering ram, is the passage in which Solomon thus writes in his Ecclesiastes, (Eccles. iii. 18-21,) "I said in my heart of the children of men that God would prove them to shew that they were like the brutes. As man dies, so do they also die. In like manner all things breathe, and man has no more than a beast of burden. All things are subject to vanity, and hasten to one place. Of earth have they been made, and to earth do they equally return. Who knows whether the spirit of the sons of Adam ascends upwards, and the spirit of beasts descends downwards?"

What if Solomon himself here answers them in one word? "Vanity of vanities, saith the Preacher, vanity of vanities, and all is vanity!" For what else does he aim at than to shew the vain sense of man, and the uncertainty of all things? Man sees that he dies like the brutes, that he has life and death in common with them; and he therefore infers that his condition is on an equality with theirs: and as nothing remains to them after death, so he makes nothing remain to himself. This is the mind of man, this his reason, this his intellect! "For the animal man receiveth not the things of the Spirit; they are foolishness unto him, neither can he understand them." (1 Cor. ii. 14.) Man looks with the eyes of flesh and beholds death present, and the only reflection he makes is, that all things have sprung from the earth, and equally return to the earth; meanwhile, he takes no account of the soul. And this is the meaning of the subjoined clause, "Who knows whether the spirit of the sons of Adam ascends upwards?" For if the subject of the soul is considered, human nature, wholly contracted in itself, comprehends nothing distinctly or clearly by studying, meditating, and reasoning.

Therefore, when Solomon shews the vanity of human sense, from the consideration, that in examining the mind, it fluctuates and is held in suspense, he by no means countenances their error, but nobly supports our faith. That which exceeds the capacity and little measure of the human mind, the wisdom of God explains, assuring us that the spirit of the sons of Adam ascends upwards. I will bring forward a similar passage from the same writer for the pur-

pose of somewhat bending their stubborn neck. "Man does not understand either the hatred or the love of God towards men, but all things are kept uncertain, because all things happen equally to the righteous and the wicked, the good and bad, to him sacrificing victims and to him not sacrificing." (Eccles. ix. 1.) If all things are kept uncertain in regard to the future, shall the believer, to whom all things work together for good, regard affliction as an evidence of divine hatred? By no means. For believers have been told, "In the world you shall have tribulation—in me, consolation." Supported by this consideration, they not only endure whatever befalls them with unshaken magnanimity, but even glory in tribulation, acknowledging with blessed Job, "Though he slay us, we will hope in him." (Job xiii. 15.)

How, then, are all things kept uncertain in regard to the future? This is only humanly speaking. But every living man is vanity. He adds, "The worst thing I have seen under the sun is, that the same things happen to all; hence the hearts of the children of men are filled with malice and contempt in their life, and afterwards are taken down to the lower regions. There is no man who can live always, or have expectation of such a thing. A living dog is better than a dead lion. For the living know that they shall die, but the dead no longer know anything. Nor have they further any reward; for their memory is given up to oblivion," &c. (Eccles. ix. 3-5.) Does he not speak thus of the gross stupidity of those who see only what is actually present, hoping neither for Future Life nor Resurrection? For even if it were true that we are nothing after death, still the Resurrection remains; and, would they fix their hopes on it, they would neither feel contempt for God, nor be filled with all kinds of wickedness, not to mention other things. Let us therefore conclude, with Solomon, that all these things are beyond the reach of human reason. But if we would have any certainty, let us run to the law and the testimony, where are the truth and the ways of the Lord. They declare to us—"Until the dust return to the earth whence it was, and the spirit return to God who gave it." (Eccl. xii. 7.) Let no one, then, who has heard the word of the Lord, have

any doubt that the spirit of the children of Adam ascends upwards. By "ascending upwards" in that passage, I understand simply subsisting and retaining immortality, just as "descending downwards" seems to me to mean lapsing, falling, becoming lost.

Their *fifth* Argument they thunder forth with so much noise, that it might arouse the sleeping out of the deepest sleep. They place their greatest hope of victory in it, and, when they would gloss over matters to their neophytes, place most dependence upon it as a means of shaking their faith and overcoming their good sense. There is one judgment, they say, which will render to all their reward—to the pious, glory—to the impious, hell-fire. No blessedness or misery is fixed before that day. This the Scriptures uniformly declare—"He will send his angels with a trumpet and a loud voice, and they will assemble his elect from the four winds, from the heights of heaven to the utmost limits thereof." (Matt. xxiv. 31.) Again, "At the end of the world, the Son of man will send his angels, and they will gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and those who do iniquity, and will send them into the furnace of fire. Then the righteous will shine forth like the sun in the kingdom of their Father." (Matt. xiii. 41.) Again, "Then will the King say to them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire." "And they shall go away, the latter to eternal punishment, and the former to eternal life." (Matt. xxv. 34.) To the same effect is the passage in Daniel xii., "And in that time shall thy people be saved, all of them whose names shall be found written in the book." They ask, If all these things have been written of the day of judgment, how will the elect be then called to the possession of the heavenly kingdom, if they already possess it? How can they be told to come, if they are already there? How will the people be then saved if they are safe now? Wherefore believers, who even now walk in faith, do not expect any other day of salvation, as Paul says, (2 Cor. iv. 14,) "Knowing that he who raised up Jesus from the dead will also

raise us up with Jesus." And elsewhere, "Waiting for the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ, who will confirm us even unto the end, against the day of his approach," &c.

But though we were to concede all these things to them, why do they make their own addition about "sleep?" For in all these, and similar passages, they cannot produce one syllable concerning sleep. Though they be awake, they may be without glory. Wherefore, since it is the part of a senseless, not to say presumptuous man, to decide peremptorily, without any authority from Scripture, on points which do not fall under human sense, with what countenance do those new and swollen dogmatists proceed to maintain a sleep of which they have heard nothing from the lips of our Lord? All persons of sense and soberness may hence see that a sleep which cannot be proved from the plain word of God is a wicked fiction. But let us take up the passages in order, lest the more simple be moved when they hear that the salvation of souls is deferred to the day of judgment.

First, we wish it to be held as an acknowledged point, as we have already explained, That our blessedness is always in progress up to that day which shall conclude and terminate all progress, and that thus the glory of the elect, and complete consummation of hope, look forward to that day for their fulfilment. For it is admitted by all, that perfection of blessedness or glory nowhere exists except in perfect union with God. Hither we all tend, hither we hasten, hither all the Scriptures and the divine promises send us. For that which was once said to Abraham applies to us also, (Gen. xv. 1,) "Abraham, I am thy exceeding great reward." Seeing, then, that the reward appointed for all who have part with Abraham is to possess God and enjoy him, and that, besides and beyond it, it is not lawful to long for any other, thither must our eyes be turned when the subject of our expectation is considered. Thus far, if I mistake not, our opponents are agreed with us. On the other hand, I hope they will concede that that kingdom, to the possession of which we are called, and which is elsewhere denominated "salvation," and "reward," and "glory," is nothing else than that union with God by which they are fully in God,

are filled by God, in their turn cleave to God, completely possess God—in short, are "one with God." For thus, while they are in the fountain of all fulness, they reach the ultimate goal of righteousness, wisdom, and glory, these being the blessings in which the kingdom of glory consists. For Paul intimates that the kingdom of God is in its highest perfection when "God is all in all." (1 Cor. xv. 28.) Since on that day, only God will be all in all, and completely fill his believers, it is called, not without reason, "the day of our salvation," before which our salvation is not perfected in all its parts. For those whom God fills are filled with riches which neither ear can hear, nor eye see, nor tongue tell, nor imagination conceive.

If these two points are beyond controversy, our hypnologists (sleep-maintainers) in vain endeavour to prove that the holy servants of God, on departing this life, do not yet enter the kingdom of God, from its being said, "Come"—"inherit the kingdom"—and so forth. For it is easy for us to answer that it does not follow that there is no kingdom because there is not a perfect one; on the contrary, we maintain that that which has been already begun is then to be perfected. This I only wish to be conceded to me when I shall have made it plain by sure Scripture argument.

That day is called "the kingdom of God," because he will then make adverse powers truly subject, slay Satan by the breath of his mouth, and destroy him by the brightness of his coming, while he himself will wholly dwell and reign in his elect. (1 Cor. xv. 24; 2 Thess. ii. 8.) God in himself cannot reign otherwise than he reigned from the beginning. Of his majesty there cannot be increase or diminution. But it is called "His kingdom," because it will be manifested to all. When we pray that his kingdom may come, do we imagine that previously it exists not? And when will it be? "The kingdom of God is within you." (Luke xvii. 21.) God, therefore, now reigns in his elect whom he guides by his Spirit. He reigns also in opposition to the devil, sin, and death, when he bids the light, by which error and falsehood are confounded, to shine out of darkness, and when he prohibits the powers of darkness from hurting those who

have the mark of the Lamb in their foreheads. He reigns, I say, even now, when we pray that his kingdom may come. He reigns, indeed, while he performs miracles in his servants, and gives the law to Satan. But his kingdom will properly come when it will be completed. And it will be completed when he will plainly manifest the glory of his majesty to his elect for salvation, and to the reprobate for confusion.

And what else is to be said or believed of the elect, whose kingdom and glory it is to be in the glorious kingdom of God, and as it were reign with God and glory in him—in short, to be partakers of the Divine glory? This kingdom, though it is said not yet to have come, may yet be in some measure beheld. For those who in a manner have the kingdom of God within them, and reign with God, begin to be in the kingdom of God; the gates of hell cannot prevail against them. They are justified in God, it being said of them, "In the Lord will all the seed of Israel be justified and praised." (Isaiah xlv. 25.) That kingdom wholly consists in the building up of the Church, or the progress of believers, who, as described to us by Paul, (Eph. iv. 13,) grow up, through all the different stages of life, into "a perfect man."

These good folks see the beginnings of this kingdom—see the increase. As soon as these disappear from their eyes, they give no place to faith, and are unable to believe what the eye of flesh has ceased to behold. Very different is the conduct of the Apostle! He says, "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ your life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." (Col. iii. 4.) He indeed attributes to us a hidden life with Christ our Head beside God; he delays the glory to the day of the glory of Christ, who, as the Head of the Church, will bring his members with him. The very same thing is expressed by John, though in different terms,—"Beloved, now are we the sons of God; but it hath not yet appeared what we shall be: but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him, since we shall see him as he is." (1 John iii. 2.) He says not that meanwhile, for some length of time, we shall be nothing; but, seeing we are the sons of God, who

wait for the inheritance of the Father, he keeps up and suspends our expectation, till that day on which the glory of Christ will be manifest in all, and we shall be glorified in him. Here, again, we cannot help wondering that, when they hear of "sons of God," they do not return to a sound mind, and perceive that this is an immortal generation which is of God, and by which we are partakers of a Divine immortality. But to proceed—

Let them cry out, as much as they please, that they are not called the blessed of God before the day of judgment, and that not before it is salvation promised to the people of God. I answer, that Christ is our Head, whose kingdom and glory have not yet appeared: if the members precede, the order is perverted and preposterous. We shall follow our Prince when he shall come in the glory of his Father, and sit in the seat of his majesty. Meanwhile, there is life in all within us that is of God—that is, our spirit, because Christ our life lives. For it were absurd to say we perish, while our life is living! This life is both beside God and with God, and is blessed because it is in God. All these things are self-evident, and in accordance with the truth. Why are those who have died in the Lord said to be not yet saved, or not yet to possess the kingdom of God? Because they wait for what they as yet have not, and have not reached the summit of their felicity. Why are they, nevertheless, happy? Because they both perceive God to be propitious to them, and see their future reward from a distance, and rest in the sure hope of a blessed Resurrection. As long as we dwell in this prison of clay, we hope for what we see not, and against hope believe in hope, as the Apostle says of Abraham. (Rom. iv. 18.) But when the eyes of our mind, now dull because buried in flesh, shall have thrown off this dulness, we shall see what we waited for, and be delighted in that rest. We are not afraid to speak thus, after the Apostle, who says conversely, that a fearful looking for of judgment awaits the reprobate. (Heb. x. 27.) If this is called "fearful," the other surely may be justly called "joyful" and "blessed."

Since it is more my purpose to instruct than to crush my

opponents, let them lend me their ear for a little, while we extract the reality from a figure of the Old Testament, and that not without authority. As Paul, in speaking of the passage of the Israelites across the Red Sea, allegorically represents the drowning of Pharaoh as the mode of deliverance by water, (1 Cor. x. 1,) so we may be permitted to say that in baptism our Pharaoh is drowned, our old man is crucified, our members are mortified, we are buried with Christ, and remove from the captivity of the devil and the power of death, but remove only into the desert, a land arid and poor, unless the Lord rain manna from heaven, and cause water to gush forth from the rock. For our soul, like that land without water, is in want of all things, till he, by the grace of his Spirit, rain upon it. We afterwards pass into the land of promise, under the guidance of Joshua the son of Nun, into a land flowing with milk and honey; that is, the grace of God frees us from the body of death, by our Lord Jesus Christ, not without sweat and blood, since the flesh is then most repugnant, and exerts its utmost force in warring against the Spirit. After we take up our residence in the land, we feed abundantly. White robes and rest are given us. But Jerusalem, the capital and seat of the kingdom, has not yet been erected; nor yet does Solomon, the Prince of Peace, hold the sceptre and rule over all.

The souls of the saints, therefore, which have escaped the hands of the enemy, are after death *in peace.* They are amply supplied with all things, for it is said of them, "They shall go from abundance to abundance." But when the heavenly Jerusalem shall have risen up in its glory, and Christ, the true Solomon, the Prince of Peace, shall be seated aloft on his tribunal, the true Israelites will reign with their King. Or—if you choose to borrow a similitude from the affairs of men—we are fighting with the enemy, so long as we have our contest with flesh and blood; we conquer the enemy when we put off the body of sin, and become wholly God's; we will celebrate our triumph, and enjoy the fruits of victory, when our head shall be raised above death in glory, that is, when death shall be swallowed up in victory. This is our aim, this our goal; and of this it has been writ-

ten, "I shall be satisfied when I awake with beholding thy glory." (Psalm xvii. 15.) These things may be easily learned from Scripture, by all who have learned to hear God and hearken to his voice.

The same things have been handed down to us by tradition, from those who have cautiously and reverently handled the mysteries of God. For ancient writers, while declaring that souls are indeed in paradise, and in heaven, have not hesitated to say that they have not yet received their glory and reward. Tertullian says, (Lib. de Resurrect. Carnis,) "Both the reward and the peril depend on the event of the Resurrection." And yet he teaches, without any ambiguity, that "previously to that event souls are with God, and live in God." In another place he says, "Why do we not comprehend that by Abraham's bosom is meant a temporary receptacle of faithful souls, wherein the image of faith is delineated, and a clear view of both judgments exhibited?" The words of Irenaeus (Lib. 9, adv. Haeres.) are, "Since our Lord departed, in the midst of the shadow of death, to the place where the souls of the dead were, thereafter rose again bodily, and after his Resurrection was taken up, it is manifest, both that the souls of his disciples, on whose account the Lord performed these things, will go away into the invisible place assigned them by the Lord, and there remain until the Resurrection, waiting for the Resurrection; afterwards recovering their bodies, and rising again perfectly, that is, bodily, as the Lord also rose, they will come into the presence of God. 'For the disciple is not above his Master,'" &c.

Chrysostom says, (Hom. 28, in xi. ad Hebr.,) "Understand what and how great a thing it is for Abraham to sit and the Apostle Paul, when he is perfected, that they may then be able to receive their reward. Unless we come thither the Father hath foretold us that he will not give the reward, as a good father who loves his children says to probable children and those finishing their labour, that he will not give food till the other brothers have come. Are you anxious because you do not yet receive? What then will Abel do, who formerly conquered, and still sits without a crown? What will Noah do? What the others of those

times? Lo! they have waited and still wait for others who are to be after thee." A little after he says, "They were before us in the contest, but they will not be before us in the crown; for there is one set time for all the crowns."

Augustine, in many passages, describes the secret receptacles in which the souls of the righteous are kept until they receive the crown and the glory, while meanwhile the reprobate suffer punishment, waiting for the precise measure to be fixed by the judgment. (De Civitate, Lib. xii. c. 9; Lib. xiii. c. 8, et alibi.) And in an Epistle to Jerome he says, "The soul after the death of the body will have rest, and will at length receive the body into glory." Bernard, professedly handling this question in two sermons delivered on the Feast of All Saints, teaches, that "the souls of the saints, divested of their bodies, still stand in the courts of the Lord, admitted to rest but not yet to glory. Into that most blessed abode," he says, "they shall neither enter without us, nor without their own bodies;" that is, neither saints without other believers, nor spirits without flesh: and many other things to the same purpose.

Those who place them in heaven, provided they do not attribute to them the glory of the Resurrection, do not differ from that view. This Augustine himself, in another place, apparently does. (De Eccles. Dogmat.) For while it is certain that wicked demons are now tormented, (as Peter affirms, 2 Pet. ii.;) yet that fire into which the reprobate will be sent on the day of judgment, is said here to be prepared for the devil. (Jude.) Both things are expressed when it is said, that they are "reserved in eternal chains against the judgment of the great day;"—"reserved" here intimating the punishment which they as yet feel not, and "chains" the punishment which they actually endure. And Augustine explains himself in another passage, (in Psalm xxxvi.) where he says, "Assuredly your last day cannot be far distant. Prepare yourself for it. Such as you depart this life, such will you be restored to that life. After that life you shall not instantly be where the saints will be, to whom it will be said, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom which was prepared for you from the foundation of the world.' That you

shall not yet be there every one knows; but you shall be where the proud and niggardly rich man in the midst of his torments saw the poor beggar, who was formerly covered with sores, resting far away. Placed in that rest you will wait secure against the day of judgment, when you will recover your body, when you will be changed and made like the angels."

Nor do I object to the illustration which he elsewhere gives, (De Quantitat. Animae,) provided a sound and moderate interpretation be given to it, viz., that "there are many states of soul, *first*, animation; *second*, sense; *third*, art; *fourth*, virtue; *fifth*, tranquillity; *sixth*, ingress; *seventh*, contemplation: or, if you rather choose it, *first*, of the body; *second*, to the body; *third*, about the body; *fourth*, to itself; *fifth*, in itself; *sixth*, to God; *seventh*, with God." I have been induced to quote these words of the holy writer, rather to shew what his views were, than with the idea of binding any one, or even myself, to adopt these distinctions. Even Augustine himself, I think, did not wish this, but was desirous, though in the plainest manner possible, to explain the progress of the soul: shewing how it does not reach its final perfection until the day of judgment. It, moreover, occurred to me, that those who so much insist on this day of judgment may by means of it be convinced of their error. For in the Creed, which is the Compendium of our Faith, we confess the Resurrection, not of the soul, but of the body. There is no room for the cavil, that by "body" is meant the whole man. We admit that it sometimes has this signification, but we cannot admit it here, where significant and simple expressions are used, in accommodation to the illiterate. Certainly the Pharisees, strong asserters of the Resurrection, and constantly having the term in their mouths, at the same time believed it was not spirit.

Still, however, they insist, and keep us to the point, quoting the words in which Paul declares that "we are of all men the most miserable" if the dead rise not. (1 Cor. xv. 19.) What need is there of the Resurrection, they ask, if we are happy before the Resurrection? Nay, where is the great misery of Christians, a misery surpassing that which

all others suffer, if it is true that they are in rest while others are afflicted and strongly tortured. Here I must tell them, that if I had any desire to evade the difficulty, (a thing on which they are always intent,) I have here ample opportunity. For what hinders us from adopting the view taken by some sensible Expositors, who understand the words to be spoken not only of the final Resurrection, by which we shall recover our bodies from corruption, incorruptible; but of the life which remains to us after our mortal life is over, and which is frequently designated in Scripture by the name of Resurrection? For when it is said that the Sadducees deny the Resurrection, it is not the body that is referred to, but the simple meaning is, that, according to their opinion, nothing of man survives death.

This view is made probable by the fact, that all the grounds on which the Apostle founds his statement might have been obviated by answering, that the soul indeed lives, but that the body, when once it has mouldered into dust, cannot possibly be raised. Let us furnish specimens. When he says, "Those who have fallen asleep in Christ have perished," he might have been refuted by the philosophers who strenuously asserted the immortality of the soul. When he asks, "What will those do who are baptized for the dead?" he might easily have been answered, that souls survive death. To the question, "Why are we in jeopardy every hour?" the reply might have been, that we expose this frail life for the immortality in which our better part will live.

We have now said much for which there would have been no occasion among persons of teachable disposition. For the Apostle himself says, that we are miserable if we have hope in Christ in this life only. This is clear beyond dispute, even he being witness, who acknowledges that his feet were almost gone, and that his steps had well-nigh slipt when he saw sinners enjoying themselves on the earth. And certainly, if we look only to the present, we will call those happy to whom everything turns out to a wish. But if we extend our views farther, we see that happy is the people whose God is the Lord, for in His hands are the issues of death.

We can adduce something still more decided, not only to refute their objections, but to explain the genuine meaning of the Apostle to those who are willing to learn without being disputatious. For if there is no Resurrection of the flesh, he justly for this one reason calls the pious unhappy, because they endure so many wounds, scourges, torments, contumely, in short, necessities of all kinds in their bodies, which they think destined to immortality; seeing they will be disappointed in this their expectation. For what can be, I do not say "more miserable," but even more ridiculous, than to see the bodies of those who live for the day indulging in all kinds of delicacies, while the bodies of Christians are worn out with hunger, cold, stripes, and all kinds of contumely, if the bodies of both equally perish! I might compare this by the words which follow, "Why are we in jeopardy every hour. I die daily through your glory, brethren," &c. "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." It were better, he says, to act on the maxim, "Let us eat," &c., if the affronts which we suffer in our bodies are not compensated by that glory for which we hope! This cannot be unless by the Resurrection of the flesh. Then, though this were given up, I can adduce another argument, viz., We are more miserable than all men if there is no Resurrection, because, although we are happy before the Resurrection, we are not happy without the Resurrection. For we say that the spirits of saints are happy in this, that they rest in the hope of a blessed Resurrection, which they could not do, were all this blessedness to perish. True, there is the declaration of Paul, that we are more miserable than all men if there is no Resurrection; and there is no repugnance in these words to the dogma, that the spirits of the just are blessed before the Resurrection, since it is because of the Resurrection.

They also bring forward what is said in the Epistle to the Hebrews concerning the ancient Patriarchs, (Heb. xi. 13,) "All these died in faith, not having received the promises, but seeing them afar off, because they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For them who say so shew that they seek a country. And, indeed, had they remembered the country from which they came, they had opportunity of

returning, but now they desire a better, that is, a heavenly country." Here our opponents argue as follows: If they desire a heavenly country, they do not already possess it: We, on the contrary, argue; If they desire, they must exist, for there cannot be desire without a subject in which it resides. And, as I attempt to force from them only, there must be a sense of good and evil where there is desire which either follows what carries an appearance of good, or shews that which appears evil. That desire, they say, lies in God, than which nothing can be imagined more ridiculous. For one of two things must follow—either that God desires something better than he has, or that there is something in God which belongs not to God. This circumstance makes me suppose that they are merely sporting with a serious matter.

To omit this, What is meant by "the power of returning?" Let them, then, return to a sound mind and listen to something better than they have yet embraced; if, indeed, they are really persuaded of that which they profess with their lips. The Apostle is speaking of Abraham and his posterity who dwelt in a foreign land among strangers; only not exiles, but certainly sojourners, scarcely sheltering their bodies by living in poor huts, in obedience to the command of God given to Abraham, that he should leave his land and his kindred. God had promised them what he had not yet exhibited. Therefore they trusted the promises afar off, and died in the firm belief that the promises of God would one day be fulfilled. In accordance with this belief, they confessed that they had no fixed abode on the earth, and that beyond the earth there was a country for which they longed, viz., heaven. In the end of the chapter he intimates, that all those whom he enumerated did not obtain the final promise, that they might not be perfected without us. Had they attended to the peculiar meaning of this expression, they never would have excited so much disturbance. It is strange how they can be blind in so much light; but still more strange that they give us bread instead of stones—in other words, support our views while seeking to overthrow them!

They think they derive strong support from what is said

in the Acts of the Apostles concerning Tabitha, who, when a disciple of Christ, full of alms and good deeds, was raised from the dead by Peter. (Acts ix. 40.) They say, an injury was done to Tabitha, if we are correct in holding that the soul, when freed from the body, lives with God and in God, since she was brought back from the society of God and a life of blessedness to this evil world. As if the same thing might not be retorted upon them! For whether she slept, or was nothing, yet as she had died in the Lord she was blessed. It was, therefore, not expedient for her to return to the life which she had finished. They must themselves, therefore, first untie the knot which they have made, since it is but fair that they obey the law which they lay upon others. And yet it is easy for us to untie it.

Whatever be the lot which awaits us after death, what Paul says of himself, (Phil. i. 23,) is applicable to all believers—"for us to die is gain, and to be with Christ is better." And yet Paul says that Epaphroditus, who certainly was in the number of believers, "obtained mercy of the Lord when sick nigh unto death," he recovered. (Phil. ii. 27.) Those men, indeed, who handle the mysteries of God with so little reverence and sobriety, would interpret that mercy as cruelty. We, however, feel and acknowledge it to be mercy, seeing it is a step of Divine mercy to sanctify the elect and glorify the sanctified. Does not the Lord then display his mercy when he sanctifies us more and more? What! if the will of God is to be magnified in our body by life, as Paul says, is it not mercy? It is not surely ours to lay down laws for the miraculous works of God; it is enough if the glory of their author shine forth in them. What if we should say that God did not consult the advantage of Tabitha, but had respect to the poor at whose prayers she was raised up, while they kept weeping and shewing the garments which Tabitha was wont to sew for them? Paul thought that this mode of living sufficed him, though it were far better for him to depart to God. After saying that God had had mercy on Epaphroditus, he adds, "And not on him only, but on me also, that I might not have sorrow upon sorrow." Go now and raise a plea against God for having given back to the

poor a woman who was diligent in supplying their wants! For, however the operation may appear to us, Christ, who died and rose again, that he might rule over the living and the dead, is certainly entitled to be glorified both in our life and in our death.

David also, the best defender of our cause, they call in as a defender of theirs, but with so much effrontery, and in a manner so devoid of common sense, that one is both ashamed and pained to mention the arguments which they borrow from him. The whole, however, with which we are acquainted we shall now honestly state. *First*, they venture to quote the words, (Psalm lxxxii. 6,) "I said, Ye are gods, and all of you exalted sons, but ye shall die like men," &c. And they interpret that believers are indeed gods and sons of God, but that they die and fall with the reprobate, so that there is the same lot to both till the lambs shall be separated from the kids. We give the answer which we have received from Christ, (John x. 34,) that "they are there called gods to whom the word of God came;" that is, ministers of God, namely, judges who bear in their hands the sword which they have received from God. Even had we not the interpretation of Christ and the usage of Scripture, which everywhere concurs, there is no obscurity in the passage itself, in which those are rebuked who judge iniquity and respect the faces of sinners. They are called gods, because acting as the representatives of God while they preside over others; but they are reminded of a future Judge to whom they must give an account of their office. See a specimen of the way in which our opponents argue!

Let us attend to another. It is said, *secondly*, (Psalm cxlvi. 4,) "His spirit will go forth and return to its earth. In that day all their thoughts perish." Here they take "spirit" for *wind*, and say, that the man will go away into the earth; that there will be nothing but earth; that all his thoughts will perish; whereas if there were any life they would remain. We are not so subtle, but in our dull way call a boat, a boat, and spirit, spirit! When this spirit departs from man, the man returns to the ground out of which he was taken, as we have fully explained. It remains, therefore, to see

what is meant by thoughts "perishing." We are admonished not to put trust in men. Trust ought to be immortal. It were otherwise uncertain and unstable, seeing that the life of man passes quickly away. To intimate this, he said, that "their thoughts perish;" that is, that whatever they designed while alive is dissipated and given to the winds. Elsewhere he says, "The sinner will see and be angry; he will gnash with his teeth and pine away; the desire of the sinner will perish," or, as it is said in another place, "dissipated:" "The Lord dissipates the counsels of the heathen:" again, "Form a scheme and it will be dissipated." The same thing, in the form of a circumlocution, is expressed by the blessed Virgin in her song, "He hath dispersed the proud in the imagination of their hearts." (Psalm cxii. 10; xxxiii. 10; Isaiah viii. 10; Luke i. 51.)

A *third* passage which they adduce is, (Psalm lxxviii. 39,) "And he remembered that they are flesh, the spirit going and not returning." They here contend, as they uniformly do, that "spirit" is used for *wind*. In this they perceive not that they not only destroy the immortality of the soul, but also cut off all hope of Resurrection. For if there is a resurrection, the spirit certainly returns; and if it does not return, there is no Resurrection! Wherefore, they ought here rather to implore pardon for their imprudence than insist on such a concession being made to them. Thus much I have said merely to let all men see how easily I might be quit were it my only object to refute their arguments. For we willingly admit, in accordance with their assertion, that the term *wind* is here applicable. We grant that men are "a wind which flies and returns not:" but if they wrest this to their own views, they err, not knowing the Scriptures, with which it is common by that kind of circumlocution to intimate at one time the weakness of man's condition, at another the shortness of life.

When Job says of man, (Job xiv. 1,) "He is a flower which cometh forth, and is cut down, and fleeth as a shadow," what more did he mean than just to say that man is fleeting, and frail, and like a fading flower? Isaiah again is ordered to exclaim, "All flesh is grass, and all the glory of man as the

flower of the grass; the grass withereth, and the flower thereof hath fallen away; but the word of the Lord endureth for ever." (Isaiah xl. 6.) Here let them infer, in one word, that the soul of man withers and pines away, and see a little more acutely than the dull fisherman who proves from it that all believers are immortal, because born again of incorruptible seed—that is, the word of God, which endureth for ever. Scripture gives the name of "fading flower" and "passing wind" to those who put their trust in this life. Having here as it were fixed their permanent abode, they think they are to reign without end; not looking to the end by which their condition is to be changed, and they must go elsewhere. Of such persons the Prophet also says, (Isaiah xxviii. 15,) "We have stipulated with death, and made a compact with hell." Deriding their vain hope, he does not account as life that which is to them the beginning of the worst death. And he affirms that they cease and die, since it were better for them not to be than be what they are.

To the same effect we read in another Psalm, "As a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth all that fear him. For he knoweth our frame, he remembereth that we are dust. And man is as grass, his day is a flower of the field, so will he flourish. For his spirit will pass away in him, and he will not subsist, and he shall no longer know his place." (Psalm ciii. 13.) If they affirm from these verses that the spirit perishes and vanishes away, I again warn them not to open a door for atheists, if there are any such, to rise up and endeavour to overthrow their faith and ours in the Resurrection, as there are certainly many. For in the same way they will infer that the spirit does not return to the body, seeing it is said that it shall no longer know its place. They may say, the inference is erroneous, since such arguing is plainly in the face of the passages relating to the Resurrection; but I rejoice that their inference also is erroneous, since the mode of arguing is common to both.

Almost similar to this is the passage in Ecclesiasticus, "The number of the years of man, as much as a hundred years, have been counted as the drop of water in the sea,

and as the sand on the sea shore ; but they are few compared with the whole duration of time. Therefore God is patient towards them, and sheds out his mercy upon them." (Ecclus. xviii. 8-10.) Here they must admit that the prophet's sentiment was very different from that which they dream, and means that the Lord pitied those whom he knew to stand by his mercy alone, and who, were he for a little to withdraw his hand, would return to the dust whence they were taken. Thereafter he subjoins a brief description of human life, comparing it to a flower which, though it blooms to-day, will be nothing more than dead herbage to-morrow.

Had he even declared that the spirit of man perishes and comes to nothing, he would not have given any defence to their error. For when we say that the spirit of man is immortal, we do not affirm that it can stand against the hand of God, or subsist without his agency. Far from us be such blasphemy! But we say that it is sustained by his hand and blessing. Thus Irenaeus, who with us asserts the immortality of the spirit, (Irenaeus adv. Haeres. lib. 5,) wishes us, however, to learn that by nature we are mortal, and God alone immortal. And in the same place he says, "Let us not be inflated and raise ourselves up against God, as if we had life of ourselves ; and let us learn by experience that we have endurance for eternity through his goodness, and not from our nature." Our whole controversy with David then, whom they insist on making our opponent, is simply this—He says, (Psalm xxxix. 11,) that man, if the Lord withdraw his mercy from him, falls away and perishes ; we teach, that he is supported by the kindness and power of God, since he alone has immortality, and that whatever life exists is from him.

A *fourth* passage which they produce is, "My soul is filled with evil, and my life has drawn near to hell. I am counted with those who go down into the deep, like a man without a helper, like the slain sleeping in their tombs, of whom thou art no longer mindful, they having been cut off from thy hand." (Psalm lxxxviii. 4.) What! they ask, if they have been cut off from the energy of God, if they have fallen away from his care and remembrance, have they not

ceased to be? As if I had it not in my power to retort. What! if they have been cut off from the energy of God, if they have escaped his remembrance, how will they ever again be? And when will the Resurrection be? Again, how do the things agree? "The souls of the just are in the hands of God," (Wisdom iii. 1 ;) or, to quote only from the sure oracles of God, "The just will be in eternal remembrance." (Psalm cxii. 6.) They have not therefore fallen from the hand of the Lord, nor escaped his remembrance. Nay, rather, in this mode of expression, let us perceive the deep feelings of an afflicted man, who complains before God that he is almost abandoned with the wicked to perdition, whom God is said not to know and to have forgotten; because their names are not written in the book of life; and to have been cut away from his hand, because he does not guide them by his Spirit.

The *fifth* passage is, (Psalm lxxxviii. 11,) "Wilt thou do wonders to the dead, or will physicians raise them up, and they will confess to thee? Will any one narrate thy mercy in the tomb, or thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" Again, (Psalm cxv. 17,) "The dead will not praise thee, O Lord, nor all who descend into the lower parts; but we who live bless the Lord from this time, yea, even for ever." Again, (Psalm xxx. 9,) "What utility is there in my blood when I shall have descended into corruption? Will the dust confess to thee, or announce thy truth?" To these passages they join another of very similar import from the song of Hezekiah, (Isaiah xxxviii. 18,) "For the grave will not confess to thee, nor will death praise thee: those who descend into the pit will not wait for thy truth. The living, the living he will confess to thee, as I too do to-day; the father will make known thy truth to his children." They add from Ecclesiasticus, "From the dead, as being nothing, there is nothing; there is no confession. Thou the living wilt confess." (Ecclus. xvii. 26.)

We answer, that in these passages the term "dead" is not applied simply to those who have paid the common debt of nature when they depart this life: nor is it simply said that the praises of God cease at death; but the meaning partly is,

that none will sing praises to the Lord save those who have felt his goodness and mercy; and partly, that his name is not celebrated after death, because his benefits are not there declared among men as on the earth. Let us consider all the passages, and handle them in order, so that we may give to each its proper meaning. *First*, let us learn this much, that though by death the dissolution of the present life is repeatedly signified, and by the lower region, (*infernus*,) the grave, yet it is no uncommon thing for Scripture to employ these terms for the anger and withdrawal of the power of God; so that persons are said to die and descend into the lower region, or to dwell in the lower region, when they are alienated from God, or prostrated by the judgment of God, or crushed by his hand. The lower region itself (*infernus ipse*) may signify, not the grave, but abyss and confusion. And this meaning, which occurs throughout Scripture, is most familiar in the Psalms: "Let death come upon them, and let them go down alive into the pit," (*infernum:*) Again, "O my God, be not silent, lest I become like those who go down into the pit," (*lacum:*) Again, "O Lord, thou hast brought up my soul from the lower region, (*inferno*,) and saved me from those going down into the pit," (*lacum:*) Again, "Let sinners be turned into *infernus*, and all the nations which forget God:" Again, "Had not the Lord assisted me, my soul had almost dwelt in *infernus:*" Again, "Our bones have been scattered along *infernus:*" Again, "He hath placed me in dark places, like the dead of the world." (Psalm xxviii. 1; liii. 15; xxx. 4; ix. 18; xiv. 7; cxliii. 3.)

In the New Testament, where the Evangelists use the term ἅδης, the translator has rendered it by *infernus*. Thus, it is said of the rich man, "When he was in hell," (*infernus*,) &c. (Luke xvi. 23.) Again, "And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven? Verily I say unto thee, thou shalt descend even unto hell," (*infernus*.) (Matt. xi. 23.) In these places it signifies not so much the locality, as the condition of those whom God has condemned and doomed to destruction. And this is the confession which we make in the Creed, viz., that Christ "descended into hell," (*in in-*

feros;) in other words, that He was subjected by the Father, on our account, to all the pains of death; that he endured all its agonies and terrors, and was truly afflicted, it having been previously said that "he was buried."

On the other hand, those are said to LIVE, and be about to live, whom the Lord visits in kindness: "For there the Lord hath commanded the blessing and life even for evermore." Again, "That he may deliver their souls from death, and nourish them in famine." Again, "The Lord will pluck thee up from thy tabernacle, and thy root from the land of the living." Again, "I will please the Lord in the region of the living." (Psalms cxxxiii. 3; xxxiii. 19; lii. 7; lvi. 14.)

To make a conclusion, let one passage suffice us, which so graphically depicts both conditions as fully to explain its own meaning, without our saying a word: It is in Psalm xlix., "Those who confide in much strength and glory in the multitude of riches. The brother does not redeem, will man redeem? Will he not give his own atonement to God, and the price of redemption for his soul, and labour for ever, and still live even to the end? Shall he not see death, when he shall see the wise dying? The unwise and the foolish will perish together. Like sheep they have been laid in the grave, (*infernus.*) Death shall feed upon them; and the just will rule over them in the morning, and assistance will perish in the grave (*infernus,*) from their glory. Nevertheless God will redeem my soul from the hand of hell, (*infernus,*) when He will receive me." The sum is, those who trust in their riches and strength will die and descend into *infernus;* the rich and the poor, the foolish and the wise, will perish together: he who hopes in the Lord will be free from the power of hell, (*infernus.*)

I maintain that these names "DEATH" and "HELL," (*Mors et Infernus,*) cannot have any other meaning in the verses of the Psalms which they obtrude upon us, nor in that song of Hezekiah; and I hold that this can be proved by clear arguments: for in the verses, "Wilt thou do wonders to the dead?" &c., and "What advantage is there in my blood?" &c., either Christ the head of believers, or the Church his body speaks, shunning and deprecating *death* as something

horrid and detestable. This too is done by Hezekiah in his song. Why do they shudder so at the name of *death*, if they feel God to be merciful and gracious to them? Is it because they are no more to be anything? But they will escape from this turbulent world, and instead of inimical temptations and disquietude, will have the greatest ease and blessed rest. And as they will be nothing, they will feel no evil, and will be awakened at the proper time to glory, which is neither delayed by their death, nor hastened by their life. Let us turn to the examples of other saints, and see how they felt on the subject. When Noah dies he does not deplore his wretched lot. Abraham does not lament. Jacob, even during his last breath, rejoices in waiting for the salvation of the Lord. Job sheds no tears. Moses, when informed by the Lord that his last hour is at hand, is not moved. All, as far as we can see, embrace death with a ready mind. The words in which the saints answer the call of the Lord uniformly are, "Here I am, Lord!"

There must, therefore, be something which compels Christ and his followers to such complaints. There is no doubt that Christ, when he offered himself to suffer in our stead, had to contend with the power of the devil, with the torments of hell, and the pains of death. All these things were to be done in our nature, that they might lose the right which they had in us. In this contest, therefore, when He was satisfying the rigour and severity of the Divine justice, when he was engaged with hell, death, and the devil, he entreated the Father not to abandon him in such straits, not to give him over to the power of death, asking nothing more of the Father than that our weakness, which he bore in his own body, might be freed from the power of the devil and of death. The faith on which we now lean is, that the penalty of sin committed in our nature, and which was to be paid in the same nature, in order to satisfy the Divine justice, was paid and discharged in the flesh of Christ, which was ours. Christ, therefore, does not deprecate death, but that grievous sense of the severity of God with which, on our account, he was to be seized by death. Would you know from what feeling his utterance proceeded? I cannot express it better

than he himself did, in another form, when he exclaimed, "Father, Father, why hast thou forsaken me?"

Those, therefore, who are dead and buried, and carried into the land of forgetfulness, He calls "forsaken of God." In this way the saints, taught by the Spirit of God, will not use these expressions in order to avert death, when coming as the call of God, but to deprecate the judgment, anger, and severity of God, with which they feel themselves to be seized by means of death. That this may not seem an invention of my own, I ask, whether a believer would call simple natural death "the wrath and terror of God?" I do not think they will be so shameless as to affirm this. But in the same passage the Prophet thus interprets that death, (Psalm lxxxviii. 7,) "Thy wrath, O God, has passed over me, and the terrors of death have troubled me." And he adds many other things applicable to the Divine anger. In another passage, (Psalm xxx. 6,) the words are, "Since there is force (*momentum*) in his indignation, and life in his favour." But I exhort my readers to have recourse to the sacred volume, that from the two entire Psalms and the Song they may satisfy themselves. Thus there will be no gloss, and I feel sure of the concurrence of those who read with judgment.

We conclude, therefore, that in these passages "*death*" is equivalent to a feeling of the anger and judgment of God, and being disturbed and alarmed by this feeling. Thus Hezekiah, when he saw that he was leaving his kingdom exposed to the insult and devastation of the enemy, and leaving no offspring from which the hope of the Gentiles might descend, was filled with anxiety, by these signs of an angry and punishing God, not at the terror of death, which he afterwards overcame without any deprecation. On the whole, I acknowledge that death in itself is an evil, when it is the curse and penalty of sin, and is both itself full of terror and desolation, and drives those to despair who feel that it is inflicted on them by an angry and punishing God. The only thing which can temper the bitterness of its agonies is to know that God is our Father, and that we have Christ for our leader and companion. Those devoid of this allevia-

tion regard death as confusion and eternal perdition, and therefore cannot praise God in their death.

The verse, "*The dead* will not praise thee," &c., concludes the praises of the people, when giving thanks to God for having by His hand protected them from danger. Its meaning is, Had the Lord permitted us to be oppressed, and to fall into the power of the enemy, they would have insulted His Name, and boasted that they had overcome the God of Israel; but now, when the Lord has repelled and crushed their proud spirit, when he has delivered us from their cruelty by a strong hand and uplifted arm, the Gentiles cannot ask, "Where is their God?" He hath shewn himself to be truly the living God! Nor can there be any doubt of his mercy, which he has so wondrously exhibited. And here those are called "dead" and "forsaken of God," who have not felt his agency and kindness towards them, as if he had delivered up his people to the lust and ferocity of the ungodly.

This view is plainly confirmed by a speech which occurs in the Book of Baruch, or at least the book which bears his name, —"Open thine eyes and see: for not the dead who are in hell, (*infernus,*) whose spirit has been torn from their bowels, will ascribe glory and justice to God; but the soul which, sad for the magnitude of the evil, walks bent and weak, and the failing eyes and the hungry soul will give glory." (Baruch ii. 17.) Here we undoubtedly see that, under the names of "*dead*" are included those who, afflicted and crushed by God, have gone away into destruction; and that the sad, bent, and weak soul, is that which, failing in its own strength, and having no confidence in itself, runs to the Lord, calls upon him, and from him expects assistance. Any one who will regard all these things as *prosopopœia,* will find an easy method of explaining them. Substituting things for persons, and death for dead, the meaning will be, The Lord does not obtain praise for mercy and goodness when he afflicts, destroys, and punishes, (though the punishment is just,) but then only creates a people for himself, who sing and celebrate the praise of his goodness, when he delivers and restores the hopes of those who were afflicted, bruised, and at

despair. But lest they should cavil, and allege that we are having recourse to allegory, and figurative interpretations, I add, that the words may be taken without a figure.

I said that they act erroneously in concluding, from these passages, that *saints after death* desist from the praises of God, and that "praise" rather means *making mention* of the goodness of God, and *proclaiming* his benefits among others. The words not only admit, but necessarily require this meaning. For to announce, and narrate, and make known, as a father to his children, is not merely to have a mental conception of the Divine glory, but is to celebrate it with the lips that others may hear. Should they here rejoin that they have it in their power to do the same thing, if (as we believe) they are with God in paradise, I answer, that to be in paradise, and live with God, is not to speak to each other, and be heard by each other, but is only to enjoy God, to feel his good will, and rest in him. If some Morpheus has revealed this to them in a dream, let them keep their certainty to themselves! I will not take part in those tortuous questions, which only foster disputation, and minister not to piety. The object of Ecclesiastes is not to shew that the souls of the dead perish, but while he exhorts us early, and as we have opportunity, to confess God, he at the same time teaches that there is no time of confessing after death; that is, that there is then no time for repentance. If any of them still asks, What is to become of the sons of perdition? that is no matter of ours. I answer for believers,—"They shall not die, but live, and shew forth the works of the Lord." "Those who dwell in His house will praise him for ever and ever." (Psalms cxviii. 17; lxxxiv. 5.)

The *sixth* passage which they adduce is, (Psalm cxlvi. 2,) "I will praise the Lord in my life; I will sing unto my God as long as I have being." On this they argue, If he is to praise the Lord in life, and while he has being, he will not praise him after life, and when he has no being! Since I think they speak thus in mere jest and sport, I will take them up in their own humour. When Virgil's Æneas promised gratitude to his hostess as long as memory should remain, did he intimate that he was one day to lose his

memory? When he said, "While life shall animate these limbs," did he not think that he would feel grateful, even among the Manes, in those fabled plains? Far be it from us to allow them to wrest the passage, so as to fall into the heresy of Helvidius! I will now speak seriously. Lest they pretend that I have not given equal for equal, I will render fivefold: "My God, I will confess to thee for ever:" "I will bless the Lord at all times; his praise shall always be in my mouth:" "I will confess to thee for ever, for thou didst it:" "I will praise thy name for ever and ever:" "So will I sing praise unto thy name for ever, that I may daily perform my vows." (Psalms xxx. 12; xxxiv. 1; lii. 9; cxlv. 1; lxi. 8.) They lately claimed David as their friend! Do they now perceive how strenuously he assails them? Have done, then, with arguments which are merely framed out of garbled passages or fragments!

Their *seventh* passage is, "Cease from me and I shall be strengthened, until I go and be no more." (Psalm xxxix. 14.) To this they join the passage of Job, "Send me away that I may for a little bewail my sorrow, before I go and return not, to the darksome land, a land armed with the blackness of death, a land of misery and darkness, where is the shadow of death, and no order, and where eternal horror dwells." (Job x. 20.) All this is irrelevant. The words are full of smart and anxiety of conscience, truly expressing, and, as it were, graphically depicting the feeling of those who, smitten with the terror of the Divine judgment, are no longer able to bear the hand of God. And they pray, that if they deserve to be cast off by God, they may at least be permitted to breathe a little from the anger of God, by which they are agitated, and that under extreme despair. Nor is it strange that the holy servants of God are brought to this, for the Lord mortifies and quickens them, takes them down to the lower regions, and brings them back. The expression "not to be," is equivalent to *being estranged from God.* For if He is the only being who truly is, those truly are not who are not in him; because they are perpetually cast down and discarded from his presence. Then I see not why the mode of expression should be so offensive to them,

when they are not said to be *absolutely dead*, but dead only with reference to men. For they are no longer with men, nor in the presence of men, but only with God. Thus (to explain in one word) "not to be" is *not to be visibly existing*, as expressed in the passage of Jeremiah, "A voice was heard in Ramah, Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, for they are not." (Jer. xxxi. 15; Matt. ii. 18.)

Let us now consider the remaining passages taken from the history of Job. We have touched on some in passing as they occurred. The first is, (Job iii. 11-19,) "Why did I not die in the womb? Why did I not perish at my birth? Why was I taken upon the knee and placed at the breast? For now, sleeping, I would be silent and rest in my sleep with the kings and rulers of the earth who build deserts for themselves, or with princes, who possess gold and fill their houses with silver, or as an abortive hidden thing would not exist, but be like those who were conceived, but never saw the light. There the wicked have ceased from turmoil, and the weary are at rest; and those once bound, freed from molestation, have not heard the voice of the oppressor. The small and the great are there, and the slave is free from his master."

What if I should retort with the 14th chapter of Isaiah, where "*the dead*" are described as coming forth from their tombs and going to meet the king of Babylon, and thus addressing him, "Lo! thou art humbled like us," &c. I would have as good ground to argue that the dead feel and understand, as they have to infer that they have lost all power of perception. But I make them welcome to all such trifling. In explaining the passage which they quote, we shall not find much difficulty, if we do not make labyrinths for ourselves. Job, when pressed with sore affliction, and in a manner borne down by the load, sees only his present misery, and makes it not only the greatest of all afflictions, but almost the only affliction. He shudders not at death, nay, he longs for it as putting all on an equal footing, as ending the tyranny of kings and the oppression of slaves, as, in short, the final goal, at which every one may lay aside the condi-

tion which has been allotted him in this life. Thus he hopes that he himself will see the end of his calamity; meanwhile, he considers not on what terms he is to live there, what he is to do, what to suffer. He only longs earnestly for a change of his present state, as is usual with those who are pressed and borne down with any grievous distress. For if, during the scorching summer's heat, we deem winter pleasant, and, on the other hand, when benumbed by the winter's cold, we wish with all our heart for summer, what will he do who feels the hand of God opposed to him? He will recoil from no evil, provided he can escape the present one. If they are not persuaded of this, there is no wonder. They excerpt and provide themselves with minute passages, but overlook the general scope. Those who have looked distinctly at the whole narrative will, I am confident, approve my explanation.

The *second* passage is, (Job vii. 7,) "Remember that my life is wind, and my eye will not return to see good, nor will the eye of man behold me. Thy eyes are upon me, and I shall not subsist. As the cloud is consumed and passes away, so he who has gone down to the lower parts will not reascend." In these words Job, deploring his calamity before God, exaggerates in this, that no hope of escape is mentioned. He only sees his calamities, which are pursuing him to the grave. Then it occurs to him that a miserable death will be the termination of a calamitous life. For he who feels the hand of God opposed to him cannot think otherwise. From this amplification he excites commiseration, and laments his case before God. I see not what else you can discover in this passage, unless it be that no Resurrection is to be expected—a point which this is not the place to discuss.

The *third* passage is, (Job xvii. 1,) "The grave alone remains for me." Again, "Everything of mine shall descend into the depths of hell," (*infernus.*) This, indeed, is most true. For nothing better remains for him who has not God propitious, as Job then thought to be his case, than hell and death. Therefore, when he had run over the whole story of his misery, he says that the last act is confusion. And this

is the end of those on whom God lays His hand. For there is death in his anger, and life in his mercy! This is not inelegantly stated by Ecclesiasticus when he says, (Ecclus. xxxvii. 28,) "The life of a man is in the number of his days, but the days of Israel are innumerable." But as the authority of that writer is doubtful, let us leave him, and listen to a prophet, admirably teaching the same thing, in his own words, (Psalm cii. 24,) "He hath broken my strength in its course, he hath shortened my days: but I said, O Lord, take me not away in the midst of my days. Thy years are eternal. Heaven and earth, which thou didst found of old, shall perish; like a vesture shall they be folded up." Thus far he has shewn how fleeting and frail the condition of man is, and how nothing under the heavens is stable, seeing they too are verging on destruction. He afterwards adds, "But thou art, and thy years shall not end. The sons of thy servants shall dwell, and their posterity shall be established before thee." (Psalm cii. 27, 28.) We here see how he connects the salvation of the righteous with the eternity of God. As often, therefore, as they bring forward Job, afflicted by the hand of God and almost desperate, representing that nothing is left to him but death and the grave, I will answer, that while God is angry, this is the only end that awaits us, and that His mercy consists in rescuing us from the jaws of death.

The *fourth* passage is, (Job xxxiv. 14,) "If He will direct his heart to him, he will draw the spirit and breath of man to himself; at the same time all flesh shall fail, and man shall return to ashes." If these words are understood of the judgment, as if it were said, that by His anger man is dissolved, cut down, confounded, and brought to nothing, I will grant them more than they ask. If they understand that *the spirit*, that is, *the soul*, at death returns to God, and that *the breath*, (*flatus*,) that is, the power of motion or the vital action, withdraws from man, I have no objection. If they contend that the soul perishes, I oppose them strenuously, although the meaning of the Hebrew is somewhat different. But, contented with disposing of their cavils, I will not pursue the matter farther.

They brandish some other darts, but they are pointless. They give no stroke, and they do not even cause much fear. For they quote some passages which, besides being irrelevant, are taken from books of doubtful authority, as the 4th of Esdras, and the 2d of the Maccabees. To these, the answer we gave in discoursing of the Resurrection is sufficient. In one thing their procedure is shameless, and is seen by all to be so, namely, in claiming Esdras, though he is wholly on our side. And they are not ashamed to bring forward the books of the Maccabees, where dead Jeremiah prays to the Lord on behalf of his warring people; and where prayers are made for the dead, that they may be delivered from their sins! Possibly they have other arguments, but they are unknown to me, as it has not been my lot to see all their fictions. I have not intentionally omitted anything which might mislead, or make any impression on the simple.

I again desire all my readers, if I shall have any, to remember that the Catabaptists (whom, as embodying all kinds of abominations, it is sufficient to have named) are the authors of this famous dogma. Well may we suspect anything that proceeds from such a forge—a forge which has already fabricated, and is daily fabricating, so many monsters'

THE END OF VOLUME THIRD OF CALVIN'S TRACTS.

GENERAL INDEX.

A

Abbots bound by the Council of Trent to preach, 84, 91.

Abel and Cain, their sacrifices, 221, 468.

Abraham, his anxious care to keep the worship of God untainted, 371; what is meant in Scripture by the bosom of, 432-434, 468.

Absolution, Popish, 101, 212, 213, 235, 289. See *Forgiveness.*

Abstinence from flesh, doctrine of the Popish Church as to, 237. See *Flesh.*

Abuses of Pastors, reference to a work so called, 23.

Accolytes, Order of, in the Popish Church, 217, 300.

Adages. See *Proverbs.*

Adam, decree of Council of Trent as to the imputation of his first sin to his posterity, 78; contrast between his seed and the seed of Christ, 93; transmitted a corrupt nature to his posterity, 79, 93, 109, 349; his free-will in a state of innocency, 112, 193; image of God in which he was created, 422-424; deliberation of the persons of the Trinity when about to create him, 424; nature of the death threatened him, 453, 454; comparison between him and Christ, 456.

ἀδὴς, meaning of the word, 480.

Adoption, Believers', the Holy Spirit the witness, earnest and seal of, 154.

Adoration of images, arguments from Scripture for, used by the Council of Nice, 75. See *Images.*

Adoration of the host, 280-282. See *Mass, Sacrifice of. Supper, Lord's.*

Adultero-German Interim, 189-239; general character of, 240-242; objectionable points in it as to which nothing ought to be yielded by the Reformers, 242. (See *Charles V.*)

Adultero-German Interim, doctrines of, as to the condition of man before the fall, 193; as to the condition of fallen man, 194; as to redemption by Christ, 195; as to justification, 196-198; as to the utility and fruits of justification, 198; as to the means by which a man receives justification, *ib.*; as to faith, 198-200; as to charity and good works, 199-201; as to works of supererogation, 201; as to confidence in the forgiveness of sins, 201; as to the Church and Catholic unity, 202-204; as to schismatics and heretics, 204; as to the marks and signs of a true Church, including unity, catholicity, and regular succession of bishops, 204, 205; as to the authority and power of the Church, 206, 207; as to one supreme Pontiff and Bishops, 207; as to the sacraments in general, 208; as to baptism being absolutely necessary to salvation, and laymen baptizing, 209, 210; as to bishops only being the ordinary ministers of confirmation, 212; as to penance, 208, 212; as to almsgiving and other good works delivering from temporal punishment, 213; as to transubstantiation, 214; as to extreme unction, 215; as to orders, 216; as to matrimony, 217-220; as to the commemoration, intercession, invocation, and merits of departed saints, 230-232; as to praying for the dead, 232-234; as to joining communion with the sacrifice of the Mass, 235; as to the ancient ceremonies used in baptism and in the Mass being continued, *ib.*; as to altars, sacerdotal vestments, crosses, tapers, and images being retained in churches, 236; as to psalmody in the churches, 237; as to vigils and obsequies of the dead being celebrated, *ib.*; as to the principal feast days

being retained, *ib.*; as to abstinence from flesh on certain days, 237, 238; as to the celibacy of the clergy, 192, 238; as to communion under both species, 192, 239; as to ecclesiastical discipline, 239.

Adultero-German Interim, refutation of the doctrines of, as to man having left him by the fall some power of choosing good, 243, 244; as to inherent righteousness concurring with the merit of Christ in our justification, 244-248; as to faith, 249-254; as to auricular confession being necessary in order to obtain pardon, 254-258; as to the temporal punishment of sin being remitted by our own satisfactions, 258, 259; as to the worship of God, 260-263; as to works of supererogation, 261; as to celibacy, 262; 329-332; as to the Apostolic succession of bishops, 264-266; as to the authority and power of the Church, 266-270; as to the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, 270-274; as to the sacraments, 274-302; as to baptism being absolutely necessary to salvation, 275; as to the delegation of the right of baptizing to women, 276; as to the Popish ceremonies used in baptism being retained, *ib.*; as to transubstantiation, 277-282; as to adoring Christ in the bread of the Supper, 280-282; as to partaking of the Eucharist under both species, 283, 284; as to confirmation being a sacrament, 284-289; as to penance being a sacrament, 289; as to extreme unction being a sacrament, 289-291; as to orders being a sacrament, 291-300; as to marriage being a sacrament, 300-302; as to marriage not being dissolved by adultery, 301; as to the sacrifice of the Mass, 302-315; as to the ceremonies of the Mass being continued, 314, 315; as to the intercession, invocation, and merits of departed saints, 316-319; as to the offering up of prayers for the dead, 321-325; as to abstinence from flesh on certain days, 325-329; as to the retaining of Popish ceremonies in divine worship, 333; as to images, 333, 334.

Adultery, error of the Papacy in maintaining that marriage is not to be dissolved on account of, 301.

Advocate, Our, the Virgin Mary declared by Council of Trent to be, 48.

Africans, The, would not concede the title of first Bishop to the Bishop of Rome, 49.

Aix, Archbishop of, a member of the Council of Trent, 34.

Alexander the Great, a saying of, quoted, 310.

Alexander III., Pope, 167, 168.

Almsgiving, enjoined by the Council of Trent as a satisfaction for sin, 100, 101, 141; and in the Adultero-German Interim, 213; has no such efficacy, 160, 258, 259; alms of the faithful in ancient times laid on the altar, 311.

Altar, worship of God designated by the term, 306; alms of the faithful in ancient times laid on, 311.

Altar, Popish, worship of *latria* not to be rendered to, 236, 385, 387.

Altars, Athenian, Paul walking round, 394.

Ambrose, 88; quoted in proof that the Virgin Mary was a sinner, 158; his learning eulogized, 180; quoted in the Adultero-German Interim, as to absolution by priests, 213; and in support of praying for the dead, 234, 307; and in support of the sacrifice of the Mass, 227, 228, 230.

Anabaptists, 349; revive the doctrine that the soul dies with the body, and that both rise again at the day of judgment, 415; Calvin's low opinion of, 416.

Anathemas of the Council of Trent, 85, 147, 177, 182-184.

Angels, their benevolent offices towards God's people in this world, 318.

Anger, men sitting in judgment ought to be free from, 26.

Annihilation, the death threatened as the punishment of sin something else than, 453.

Anti-Popes, three, 292.

Anthropomorphites, The, 423, 424.

Apocrypha, included by the Council of Trent among the books of inspiration, 64, 65; curse pronounced on such as do not thus receive it, 65, 68; attempts of the Popish Church to prove their doctrines from, 68, 129, 231, 317; not received as canonical by the fathers, 70; and not to be so received by us, 267, 424, 430.

Apollinaris, 439.

Apollo, Priestesses of, allusion to, 35.

Apollonius quoted, 339.
Apostasy from God, death to be accounted less grievous than, 410.
Apostles, The, meaning of the power of binding and loosing committed to, 256, 257; auricular confession unknown to, 140, 257; Popish bishops not successors of, 265, 295, 296; gifts of the Spirit conferred by the laying on of the hands of, 286, 287; were not priests, 303, 304; a lawful commemoration of, 315, 316; do not pray for saints on earth, 316, 317; are not to be prayed to, 318, 319; not supporters of celibacy, 45, 337, 338.
Apostolic See. See *Roman See.*
Apostolic succession in Romish Church, 203, 264, 265, 291-299.
Aquila, Council of, 58.
Aquinas, Thomas, 336.
Arabs, doctrine that the soul dies with the body, and that both rise again at the day of judgment, originated by some, 415.
Arausican Council, 312.
Archbishops bound by the Council of Trent to preach, 83.
Archpresbyters bound by the Council of Trent to preach, 83.
Arians, 431.
Ariminum, Council of, 30.
Aristarchus, Paul III. ironically so termed, 36.
Aristophanes, the Poet, reference to his writings, 35.
Aristotle, quoted as to the importance of good domestic training, 407; reference to his discourses as to the human soul, 420.
Arnobius, quoted in Adultero-German Interim in support of the sacrifice of the Mass, 228, 307.
Assurance, full, of forgiveness and salvation, attainable by believers in this world, 125-127, 154; this denied by the Popish Church, 105, 201; refutation of doctrine of Council of Trent in making assurance of salvation to depend on the view of works, 146; doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to, 201.
Athanasius, quoted in the Adultero-German Interim in support of the sacrifice of the Mass, 227, 307.
Athenian altars, Paul walking round, 394.
Augsburg, Diet of the States of the Roman Empire that sanctioned the Adultero-German Interim held at, 190.
Augustine, quoted in proof that the Councils of the Church may err, 30; quoted as to the canon of Scripture, 70, 85; as to sin existing in the regenerate while they are in this world, 88; as to there being nothing good in the will of man by nature, and that it must be made good by the grace of God, 111-113, 121, 148, 149; as to faith being the life of the soul, 119, 159; as to the assurance of salvation, 127; as to no dependence being to be placed on the righteousness of works, 128, 145; as to the impossibility of the perfect observance of the law by the best of men in the present state, 131; as to God's acting not merely permissively in reference to the sins of men, 149, 150; as to all good works proceeding from faith as their root, 150; as to the Virgin Mary being a sinner, 157; in opposition to Purgatory, 161; as complaining of the numerous rites existing in the Church in his time, 178; his learning eulogized, 180, 214, 221; quoted in the Adultero-German Interim in support of the sacrifice of the Mass, 227-229, 307, 315; and in support of the commemoration of saints, 230; and in support of praying for the dead, 234, 235; extols the continuous succession of Bishops, 264; reference to his controversy with the Donatists, 265; quoted as to the meaning of the laying on of the Apostles' hands when conferring the gifts of the Spirit, 287; his error in approving of prayers being offered up for the dead, 321, 322, 346, 349; and in maintaining the absolute necessity of the baptism of infants to their salvation, 345, 355; and in maintaining that such as have not partaken of the Lord's Supper perish, 355; quoted as to Cyprian's constancy to the cause of Christ in death, 364; regarded the parable of Lazarus and the rich man as a true history, 431; quoted as to the blessedness of believers in heaven, 434; his retractations, 452, 469, 470.
Auricular confession, attempts of the Popish Church to prove it from

Scripture, 69, 101, 139, 212, 213; introduced by Innocent III., 140, 257; evils of, 140, 141, 107, 160, 258; to be made before joining in communion at the sacrifice of the Mass, 235; refutation of the doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to its necessity to forgiveness, 254-258, 289; not sanctioned by Christ and his Apostles, 257; why so strongly defended by the Papacy, *ib.*

Aurelium, Council of, its doctrine as to the Popish sacrament of confirmation, 173, 183, 211, 288.

Authority, Human, to be repudiated in matters of religion, 173.

B

Babylonians, their worship of images, 403.

Banners, worship of *latria* not to be rendered to, 333.

Banquet of the Salii, 384.

Baptism, remission of sins and regeneration exhibited in, 86, 467; children of believing parents born members of the Church, and not constituted such by, 110, 347-350; instituted by Christ, 173; is efficacious only by faith, 174-176; God alone properly acts in and by, 176; mutilated and vitiated by the Romish Church, 179; not absolutely necessary to salvation, 180; a seal of the righteousness of faith, 181, 182; half its efficacy destroyed by the Popish sacrament of Confirmation, 183; design of, 274; profaned if administered to aliens, 350-352; valid when administered by Popish priests, 351; is in no circumstances to be administered by women, 353, 355. See *Women.*

Baptism of infants, decree of the Council of Trent as to, 79; has not its origin in tradition, 269; not absolutely necessary to their salvation, 275, 347, 353-355; ground of, 275, 347, 351; thought by Pelagius to be superfluous, 346; is a proof of the doctrine of original sin, *ib.*; error of Augustine in maintaining its absolute necessity to salvation, 354, 355; parents ought not to neglect to receive baptism for their infants, 354, 355.

Baptism, doctrines of the Council of Trent as to, that original sin is remitted in, and everything having the proper nature of sin taken away by, 80, 85, 87; that it is the instrumental cause of justification, 96, 116, 117; that there is no transference to a state of grace without, 109; that it is essential to admission into heaven, 109, 165; that women may administer it in cases of necessity, 177, 344, 346, 352; (See *Women;*) that the administration of it is to be accompanied with superstitious rites, 178; that its efficacy depends on the intention of the priest who administers it, 164, 165, 177, 180; Canons of the Council as to baptism, 165, 166; antidote to these Canons, 179-183; reason assigned by the Council why baptism ought not to be repeated, 164, 176.

Baptism, doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to, 209, 210; recommendation of the Interim that the ancient ceremonies used in the administration of it should be continued, 235, 269, 276; baptism of infants held by the Interim to be absolutely necessary to their salvation, 275; confirmation deemed by the Interim a worthier sacrament than baptism, 288, 289.

Baptism of John, held by the Council of Trent to have less force than the baptism of Christ, 165, 179.

Baptismal penitence, Popish distinction between this and penitence after a lapse, 139.

Baptismal regeneration, decree of Council of Trent as to, 79.

Baruch, one of the Apocryphal books, quoted, 403, 455, 484.

Basil the Great, quoted in the Adultero-German Interim in support of the sacrifice of the Mass, 230.

Basle, Council of, 59, 293.

Believers, freed from the guilt of sin though not exempt from blame, 85, 86; not free from sin so long as they are in this world, 88; not justified by their own works, 128; do not, after being once justified, obtain an increase of justification by their good works, 129; do not and cannot perfectly obey the law in the present state, 130-132, 134; the peace they have on receiving the gospel, 433; a higher peace to be

enjoyed by them in heaven, 433-435, 467 ; their blessedness after death compared to a sleep, 432, 434, 435 ; and to resting, 432-435 ; eternal life begun in them in this life, 440; their safety in death, 436, 450, 456; their happiness not completed till the last day, 468-470; receptacle for their souls between death and last judgment, 468, 469. See *Heaven. Resurrection.*

Bernard, quoted in support of the doctrine that faith gives assurance of salvation, 127, 154 ; and as to the ambition of the Bishops of Rome in his time, 187 ; quoted in the Adultero-German Interim in vindication of praying for the dead, 234, 469.

Bible. See *Scriptures.*

Bishops, Universal, appellation of, belongs to Christ alone, 49 ; title of, assumed by the Bishop of Rome, denounced by Gregory as blasphemous, 273.

Bishop of Rome. See *Rome, Bishop of. Pope.*

Bishops, Popish, bound by the Council of Trent to preach, 83 ; alone are the ordinary ministers of confirmation, 167, 184, 212; forbidden by Council of Trent to absent themselves from their dioceses for more than half a year, 185 ; succession of, 205, 264, 265, 291-299 ; title of successors of the Apostles denied to, 265, 295, 296 ; elevation to the office of, often obtained by Simony, 294, 295 ; Leo the Great, and Gregory the Great, quoted as to the election of, 294 ; character of persons raised to the office of, described, 295.

Body, the soul distinct from, 425-427 ; is the prison of the soul, 443.

Body, put for the sin of our depraved nature, 439 ; home put for, 442.

Boniface, Bishop of Rome, reference to, 58, 336.

Brazen serpent, was ultimately worshipped by the Jews as an image of the true God, 391.

Brutes, the phrase "living soul" repeatedly applied to, 450 ; difference between the living soul of brutes and the living soul of men, 351 ; are not immortal, 462.

Bull, Papal, calling the Council of Trent, 20. See *Mantua*, &c.

C

Cain and Abel, their sacrifices, 221.

Calf, Golden, made by Aaron, intended to be a visible representative of the true God, 391, 392.

Caligula, Caius, agitation excited among the Jews by his ordering his statue to be set up in the temple, 342.

Call of the gospel, difference between the outward and inward, 155.

Calves set up by Jeroboam, intended to represent the true God, 392.

Calvin, John, ambition and impiety of Romanists in his day, 18; reference to his treatise on "The Necessity of Reforming the Church," *ib.*; his doubts whether the Council of Trent would be ever held, even after the Papal Bull was issued, 37; ignorance of the Popish clergy in his time, 76; his heroic resolution of constancy in the Reformed Faith, 343, 411 ; his Tract on the "True Method of Reforming the Church" reprinted in Germany in a corrupted form, 344 ; his estimate of the value of his labours in the Church, 344, 358 ; held the validity of Popish baptism, 351 ; his low opinion of the Anabaptists, 416 ; character of the age in which he lived, 417, 418.

Canonical elections in the Church of Rome, 294.

Canons or decrees of Council of Trent, previously concocted by some ten or twenty monks, 34-36, 50 ; the power of forming canons claimed to the Church by the Papacy, 206, 207. See *Trent.*

Cardinals, 294.

Carnotensis, Ivo, 336.

Carthage, Council of, forbade the invocation of saints, 60 ; views of, as to the canonical books of Scripture, 70 ; forbade the assumption of the title of sovereign Pontiff, or even first Bishop by any, 89; prohibited women from administering baptism, 356.

Catechumens, 96, 119.

Catharinus, Ambrosius, a Dominican, his speech at the Council of Trent, 48, 49 ; his prostration by Luther referred to, 48 ; affirms the Virgin Mary to be our advocate, *ib.*; holds the Pope to be the Vicar of Christ, 49.

Cathedral, or Metropolitan Churches, one man forbidden by the Council of Trent to hold more than one of, 167, 185.
Catherine, Saint, 321.
Catholicity, a mark of the true Church, according to the Papacy, 205.
Cato, his address to the Roman people, urging them to correct their extravagant expenditure. 18.
Celestial hierarchy, 234, 322.
Celibacy of the Popish clergy, not sanctioned by the Apostles, 45, 337, 338 ; its demoralizing effects, 45, 332, 333, 339 ; recommendation and doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to, 238, 262, 302, 329-332 ; origin of, 331 ; Cenalis's advocacy of, animadverted upon, 337-340 ; tyranny of the Church of Rome as to, 378.
Cenalis, Robert, Bishop of Auvergne, 334-341 ; his defamation of marriage, 337-340.
Ceremonies in religion, 263, 275, 306, 333 ; connected with the celebration of the Mass, 314, 315, 386 ; impure, 371. 373, 374, 377, 393 ; indifferent, 379, 391 ; such as are not to be observed, 379-383. See *Rites.*
Ceres, mysteries of, referred to, 75.
Cervinus, Marcellus, a legate of the Pope to the Council of Trent, 19 ; his character, 52, 92.
Chapter, The, regulation of Council of Trent as to the filling up of a vacant See by, 170.
Charity, doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to, 199-201 ; always attends true faith, 249 ; no charity of which Christ is not the bond, 416.
Charles V., the interim or declaration of religion of, 190-239 ; requires the common states to maintain uniformity in religion, 192 ; promises a reformation of the Church, 193.
Chastisements inflicted by God upon his people, 142, 161.
Chastisements of the flesh, Popish doctrine of, 302, 303.
Children. See *Parents.*
Children of believing parents. See *Parents, Believing.*
Chrism. See *Oil. Extreme Unction.*
Christ, the only mediator between God and man, 320 ; is set aside as such by the Papacy, 60.
Christ, sacrifice of, forgiveness to be sought for only through, 139 ; in it he bore the full punishment of his people's sins, 141, 142 ; we are reconciled to God by, 152, 153 ; doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to, 220-230 ; was prefigured by the Levitical sacrifices, 222 225 ; only once offered, 309, 312, 385 ; is despoiled of its glory by the Mass, 383, 387, 390.
Christ, death of, the Mass destroys the sacrament of the Supper as a memorial of, 383, 385, 388-390, 396 ; meaning of the phrase that he could not be holden of death, 437, 438 ; Jonah's being in the whale's belly a type of, 438 ; death of the soul he underwent on our account, 455, 482, 483 ; his promise to the thief on the cross, 446-448.
Christ, resurrection of, the only ground of hope of ours, 436 ; Isaac's being restored to his father from death a type of, 438.
Christ, righteousness of, the only ground of our justification, 116-118, 120, 244-247 ; inherent righteousness and human satisfactions mixed with, by the Papacy, 196, 197, 199, 213.
Christ, redemption accomplished by, doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to, 195 ; is eternal, 312 ; includes deliverance from temporal punishment as well as from eternal death, 258, 259.
Christ, grace of, as second Adam, more powerful than that of the first, 112, 456.
Christ, his preaching to the spirits in prison, meaning of the phrase, 428, 429.
Christ, to him alone belongs the appellation of Universal Bishop, 49 ; falsehood of the pretensions of the Pope to be the Vicar of, *ib.* ; Popish doctrine of adoring him in the bread of the Eucharist, 280-282 ; the gifts of the Spirit with which he was endowed, 286 ; his fasting forty days in the wilderness explained, 327, 328 ; no unity in the Church except in him, 416.
Christ, seed of, contrast between them and the seed of Adam, 93.
Christ, confession of. See *Confession of Christ.*
Christ, truth of, caution against moderation in defending, 310.

Christians, not forbidden all intercourse with unbelievers, 374; forbidden to have fellowship with them in their superstitions, 374, 375.
Christopher, Saint, 321.
Chrysostom, 60; quoted as to the Virgin Mary being a sinner, 158; as to works of supererogation, 201; quoted in the Adultero-German Interim in support of the sacrifice of the Mass, 227, 228, 230; approved of praying for the dead, 234, 321, 322; maintained that the image of God in which man was at first created consisted in his dominion over the brutes, 423; his view as to the parable of Lazarus and the rich man, 432, 468.
Church of Christ, God a wall and rampart to, 44; Augustine's complaint of her numerous rites in his time, 178; has always existed in the world, 264, 266; the Scriptures not to be submitted to the authority of, 267; legitimate power of, 269; no supremacy over her granted to Peter, 270, 271; the name of, falsely assumed by the Papacy, 286; would not cease though pastors were wanting, 266, 297, 298.
Church, Peace of, one of the objects for which the Council of Trent was called, 20, 23; Hilary quoted as to, 240; we are cautiously to look at the kind of peace offered to us, 240-242.
Church, Unity of, doctrine of Adultero-German Interim as to, 202-205; true nature of, 266, 416.
Church, Reformation of. See *Reformation of the Church.*
Church of Rome. See *Popish Church.*
Church, clergy meant by, in the Papacy, 76.
Church, Eastern, auricular confession scarcely ever used throughout, 140; the Popish Church not the mother of, 180.
Churches, arguments of the Council of Nice from Scripture for adorning them with images and pictures, 75.
Churches, Metropolitan or Cathedral, Council of Trent appoint lectures on Scripture to be delivered in, 81, 90; one man forbidden by the same Council to hold more than one of them at the same time, 167, 185.
Church property, the Reformers charged with plundering, 23; Reformers vindicated from the charge, 43; how misapplied under the Papacy, 185.
Cicero, 50, 52.
Circumcision, 173, 181, 350, 354, 357.
Clergy, Popish. See *Popish Clergy.*
Clermont, Bishop of, sent by France to the Council of Trent, 33; his infamous character, 33, 34.
Clermont, Council of, its doctrine as to the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, 106, 157.
Clithoveus, his argument in support of the Mass, 304.
Cloisters of monks and nuns, obscenity in, 45.
Cochlaeus, 336.
Command of God to be implicitly obeyed, 365, 369; even the least to be observed, 399-401
Commemoration of the dead, two kinds of, in the Popish Church, 315.
Commodus, Lucius, 322.
Communion, Holy. See *Supper.*
Concord. See *Church, Peace of.*
Concupiscence, or the motions of sin in the regenerate, decreed by the Council of Trent not to be sin, 80, 87, 88, 133, 160, 161; doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to, 194, 195, 197, 210.
Confession, Auricular. See *Auricular.*
Confession of Christ, binding upon all, 376, 377; violated by joining in impious superstitions, 377; a man's confession of faith ought to be regulated by his knowledge, 402.
Confidence of the forgiveness of sins. See *Assurance, Full, of forgiveness.*
Confidence, Sleep used in Hebrew for, 435.
Confirmation, Popish sacrament of, 163, 164, 167, 176; doctrine of the Council of Aurelium as to, 173, 183; destroys half the efficacy of baptism, 183; virtue attributed to chrism or oil in, 167, 380; this an insult to the Holy Spirit, 184; a bishop alone the ordinary minister of, 167, 184; doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to, 208, 210; and as to the use of chrism and the sign of the cross in, 211, 285; is not a sacrament, 183, 284-289; deemed a worthier sacrament than baptism, 288, 289.
Conscience, enslaved by Popery, 39, 40, 70, 166, 181, 328, 329; God the only Lord of, 270.

Conscience, Good, the inseparable attendant of faith, 144 ; never at ease until it rest in the mercy of God, 153, 154.
Conscience, An evil, the worst executioner, 458.
Conscience, Peace of, connected with the doctrine of justification through the imputation of Christ's righteousness alone, 244, 245 ; results from an undoubting faith in acquittal, 256.
Constancy in confessing the faith enjoined, 341-343.
Controversy, importance of distinctly laying down the subject in, 419.
Convents, decree of the Council of Trent as to the establishment of Scripture lectureships in, 82.
Conversion, God's agency on the will in, 112, 113.
Cornelius, Bishop, a member of the Council of Trent, 50 ; his oration made up of patches of sentences from Cicero, 50, 52 ; his profanation of Scripture, 50, 51 ; his blasphemy in ascribing to the Pope what exclusively belongs to Christ, 51 ; his eulogium on Paul III., 50, 52, 53.
Council, General, cannot err, according to the Papacy, 30, 33 ; decisions of, not to be implicitly assented to, 30 ; difference between it and the tribunal of the Holy Spirit, 33; the decrees of, maintained by Romanists to proceed from the Holy Spirit, 32, 34, 35, 42, 163 ; interim or declaration of religion of Charles V. to be observed until the decision of, 190-193 ; Council of Trent falsely called a Universal Council, 57.
Councils of the Church, authorized by God as a remedy for curing her diseases, 30. See *Aquila*, &c.
Councils of the Church, Ancient, doctrine and whole administration of the Papacy at variance with the majority of, 32 ; summoned by royal edicts, 58 ; the Bishop of Rome did not possess or claim the right of calling them, *ib.*
Councils of the Church, Spurious, 89.
Councils of the Church in most repute with the Romanists characterized by ignorance and ferocity, 33.
Council of Aquila, 58.
Council of Ariminum, 30.
Council of Arrelium. See *Aurelium, Council of.*
Council, Arausican, 312.
Council of Basle, 59, 293.
Council of Carthage. See *Carthage, Council of.*
Council of Clermont. See *Clermont, Council of.*
Council, Lateran. See *Lateran Council.*
Council of Lyons, 168, 170.
Council of Nice. See *Nice, Council of.*
Council of Toulouse, 56.
Council of Vienna, 171.
Cross, sign of, used in the Popish sacrament of confirmation, 211 ; worship of *latria* not to be rendered to, 236, 333.
Curates bound by the Council of Trent to preach, 83.
Curse of death, how believers are delivered from, 436.
Curse of the law, all men acknowledge that they are subject to, 129.
Custom, Power of, 321.
Cyprian, 49; called to order and charged with error, ignorance, and obstinacy, Stephen, Bishop of Rome, *ib.* ; his learning eulogized, 180, 187 ; quoted as to the Levitical sacrifices, 221 ; quoted in the Adultero-German Interim, in support of the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, 208; disingenuousness of this quotation, 273, 322 ; his constancy to the cause of Christ in death, 364 ; regarded the parable of Lazarus and the rich man as a true history, 431.
Cyril, regarded the parable of Lazarus and the rich man as a true history, 431, 437.

D

Daniel, his constancy, 370 ; the history of his being cast into the den of lions, not received as inspired by all, *ib.* ; worshipped God in purity in the midst of idolatry, 371.
Daniel, Companions of, their heroism in refusing to worship Nebuchadnezzar's image, 370, 386.
David, his dancing before the ark gives no support to fictitious modes of worship, 263.
Day, Last, the happiness of the saints not completed till, 468-470.
Deacons, Order of, in the Popish Church, 217, 299; sub-deacons, 217.
Dead, The, mass offered for the redemp-

tion of, 59; two kinds of commemoration of, in the Papacy, 315; doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to, 232-234; praying for, a very ancient custom, 321; the practice pleaded for from apostolic tradition, 322: unsupported by Scripture, 323-325; vigils for, not to be retained in the Church, 325. See *Saints*.

Death, to be accounted less grievous than apostasy from God, 410; a two-fold, described in the Apocalypse, 446; error of such as hold that the soul dies or sleeps between death and judgment, 413, 414, 419. See *Soul, Human*.

Death threatened as the punishment of sin, import of, 453.

Death of the soul, what it is, 454, 455.

Death of Christ. See *Christ, death of*.

Death, curse of, believers delivered from, 436, 456.

Death of believers, compared to a sleep, 432, 434, 435, 458.

Death of the wicked, compared to a sleep, 458, 459.

Death often put for a feeling of the anger and judgment of God, 479, 480, 483, 484.

Decrees of Council of Trent. See *Trent, Decrees of Council of*.

Deities, tutelar of the heathen, 395.

Damascenus, quoted in the Adultero-German Interim, in support of the sacrifice of the Mass, 228; and to prove that praying to the dead is derived from apostolic tradition, 234.

Demons, power ascribed by the Papists to lustral water to expel, 333.

Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, 322.

Dionysius, the Areopagite, quoted in the Adultero-German Interim, in support of the commemoration of departed saints, 230; and to prove that praying to the dead is derived from apostolic tradition, 234; his celestial hierarchy, 234, 322.

Dionysius of Corinth, 322.

Discipline, Ecclesiastical, the restoration of, a professed object for which the Council of Trent was called, 20, 23; no means employed by that Council for that object, 41; recommendation of the Adultero-German Interim as to, 239.

Discussion, Free, advocated, 32; not allowed in the Council of Trent, 37, 39, 40; importance of distinctly laying down the subject in discussion, 419.

Dispensations *de promorendo* and *de non promorendo*, regulation of Council of Trent as to, 170, 186.

Dissembling our convictions of the truth of Christ censured, 362, 363, 366, 404.

Dives and Lazarus, 430, 431.

Divorce, 218, 219.

Dogmatism in matters of religion condemned, 417.

Domestic training, Good, Aristotle quoted as to the importance of, 407; duty of, 408, 409.

Dominic, 321.

Donatists, The, reference to Augustine's controversy with, 265.

Dreams, knowledge of God designated by, 306.

Dulia and *Latria*, Popish distinctions of worship, 46, 236, 323.

Duty to be measured by the rule of God's word, 406.

Dying, The, extreme unction administered only to, 290.

E

Ecclesiasticus, one of the books of the Apocrypha, attempts of the Popish Church to support their doctrines from, 68, 129; not inspired, 70.

Eleazer refused to ransom his life by tasting swine's flesh, 398, 399.

Elect, The, alone are called inwardly, 155; faith produced in them only by the Spirit of God, 250, 253, 254.

Election, denied by the Council of Trent that God's people may attain the knowledge of their, 100, 105; this knowledge attainable, 135, 136, 155.

Elections, canonical, in Church of Rome, 294.

Eleemosynary Quæstors, prohibited to preach by the Council of Trent, 85.

Elisha, Naaman the Syrian's request of him for permission to worship in the house of Rimmon after his conversion from idols, 401-403.

Encratites, The, condemned marriage, 220.

Epiphanius approved of praying for the dead, 234, 321; quoted in opposition to women administering baptism, 356.

Erasmus, reference to his animadversions on the errors of the Vulgate, 74, 183. See *Vulgate*.

Error, decree of Council of Trent as to preachers who may disseminate error among the people, 84.
Esdras, one of the books of the Apocrypha, quoted in proof that the soul lives after death, 430, 490.
Eternal duration, Yesterday put for, 448.
Eternal life, merited, according to the Papacy, by good works and suffering, 102, 106, 133, 158; this doctrine refuted, 144-146; the reward of, not the only motive to holy obedience, 162; is begun in believers in this world, 440; is promised, *ib.*
Eucharist, Sacrament of. See *Supper, Lord's.*
Eugenius, deposed from the Papacy by the Council of Basle, 293.
Eusebius quoted, 322, 326, 339.
Exorcism, Popish doctrine of, 68; ceremony of, in baptism, 235, 238, 269, 283, 299; the sprinkling of water consecrated by exorcisms unlawful, 379, 380.
Exorcists, Order of, in the Popish Church, 217, 299.
Extirpation of heresies, one of the objects for which the Council of Trent was called, 20.
Extravagance of the Popish clergy, 340.
Extreme Unction, maintained to be a sacrament by the Council of Trent, 163; and in the Adultero-German Interim, 208, 215, 216; is no sacrament, 172, 289-291; administered only to the dying, 290; ought not to be received, 379, 380.

F

Faber, reference to his animadversions on the errors of the Vulgate, 74.
Faith, True, the instrument of justification, 118, 124, 125, 128, 151, 153, 155, 249; agency of the Spirit in producing, 113, 250, 252, 253; cannot, according to the Council of Trent, unite to Christ unless hope and charity are added to it, 118; nature of, 119, 127, 250-252; the completion not less than the commencement of justification to be ascribed to, 122; a good conscience the inseparable attendant of, 144; not altogether extinguished by the sins of God's people, *ib.*; all good works must proceed from, 150; is not alone, 151, 152, 249; assurance of salvation derived from, 154; termed by Augustine the life of the soul, 119, 159; the grace conferred in the sacraments to be ascribed to, 174; doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to, 198-200; refutation of the doctrine of the Interim as to, 249-254; produced by the Spirit in the elect alone, 250, 253, 254; enables us to perceive the efficacy of Christ's death, 303.
Faith, Righteousness of, opposed to the righteousness of the law, 114, 115.
Faith, worthless distinction made by the Council of Trent between an informal and a formed faith, 96, 107, 118, 119, 159, 249, 250; doubting faith of Papists, 97, 98, 125, 126.
Fall, The, doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to the condition of man before, 193; its doctrine as to the condition of man fallen, 194.
Family Training. See *Domestic Training.*
Fasting enjoined by the Council of Trent to be observed every Friday in remembrance of our Lord's passion, 56, 100, 101; this mere will-worship, 60, 326, 327; enjoined by the Adultero-German Interim as a satisfaction for sin, 213, 237, 238; absurdity of this doctrine, 303.
Fathers, The, defective, 307; deviated from the pure institution of the Lord's Supper, 308; quoted in opposition to women administering baptism, 356; and as to the parable of Lazarus and the rich man being a true history, 430-432, 470.
Fear of hell, often restrain men from sin, 151.
Fear, Holy, of falling into sin, inculcated, 137.
Feast days of the Romish Church, curates and other inferior clergy bound by the Council of Trent to preach on, 83; several of them enumerated, 237, 320, 327.
Feasts of idols, 375, 397.
Fellowship with impious superstitions forbidden, 393, 394, 403, 404.
Female heroism, 398. See *Women.*
Female Pope, Joan, 293.
Festivity designated by a white robe, 446.
Fire put for the Holy Spirit, 353.
Flesh, Popish doctrine of abstinence from, on certain days, 237, 238; no

foundation for this doctrine, 325-329; tyranny of the Popish Church in interdicting the eating of flesh on particular days, 378. See *Meats.*
Flesh offered to idols why not to be eaten, 373-375, 396, 397.
Forgiveness of sins, our justification consists in, 114, 152, 244-246, 254, 255; full assurance of, attainable by believers in the present state, 105, 125-127, 154, 201; to be sought for in Christ's blood alone, 139; not to be obtained by auricular confession, nor by human satisfactions, 101, 139-141; 254-258, 289; to be obtained solely by the free grace of God, 141; baptism, a seal of, 181, 182. See *Absolution.*
Fortitude in the cause of God recommended, 342, 410, 411.
France, sent only two bishops to the Council of Trent, 33.
Free will, sentiments of the Council of Trent that the human will has still some power left to choose good, 93, 94, 104, 108-113; same sentiments maintained in the Adultero-German Interim, 194; erroneousness of this doctrine, 243, 244; free will of Adam in a state of innocency, 112, 193, 194. See *Will, Human.*
Friendship, persons sitting in judgment ought not to be influenced by, 26, 27.
Frogs of Aristophanes, debates of monks compared to the croaking of, 35.

G

Galienus, 322.
Gelasius, edict of, as to communion under both species, 283.
Gentiles, The, sacrifices prevalent among, 222, 224; idolatry of, 369, 376, 387; tutelar deities of, 395; specious but groundless distinction that has been drawn between Gentile and Popish idolatry, 390-393.
Gentile superstitions not worse than Popish, 378.
Germany, Almost all, twice abandoned the Roman See before the Reformation, 292.
Germanic Empire, The, Interim or declaration of religion of Charles V., for maintaining tranquillity throughout, 190-239. See *Adultero-German Interim.*
Gestures, bodily, images not to be reverenced by, 369.
Glory, designated by a white robe, 446.
God, a wall and rampart to his Church, 44; the author of a good will, 110-112; how he requires of us in his law what is above our strength, 113; acts not merely passively in reference to the sins of men, 149, 150; inflicts chastisement upon his people, 142, 161; importance of standing up in defence of the right mode of worshipping, 243, 260; must be worshipped spiritually, his will being the only rule, 260-263; the alone Lord of the conscience, 270; worship of, designated by the terms temple, altar, incense, sacrifice, 306; knowledge of, designated by dreams and visions, *ib.*; his commands, even the least, to be implicitly obeyed, 365, 369, 399-401; his image in which man was at first created, 422-424; is the life of the soul, 441.
Gods, false, of the Gentiles, 376.
Gods, judges so called, 475.
Gospel, error of the Council of Trent as to the nature of, 106, 156; difference between the law and the gospel, 156, 251. See *Call.*
Grace of God, The, error of Council of Trent as to our co-operating with, in our justification, 110-112; acts irresistibly, 111; alone enables the will of man to choose good, 148, 149; justification the fruit of, 153; a doctrine of the Council of Trent that the sacraments confer, 164; this doctrine disproved, 175; Popish Church transfers to man what belongs to, 243.
Grace, state of, no transference to, according to the Council of Trent, without baptism, 109.
Gratian, quoted as to the election of the Pope, 294.
Gregory the Great, opposes the claim of the Bishop of Rome to the title of Universal Bishop, 49, 187, 273; quoted in the Adultero-German Interim in support of the sacrifice of the Mass, 230; quoted as to the election of bishops, 294; regarded the parable of Lazarus and the rich man as a true history, 431.
Gregory VII., 292.
Gregory X., Pope, 168.

H

Hatred, Men sitting in judgment ought to be free from, 26, 27.
Heathen poets quoted, 417, 451, 459.
Heathen. See *Gentiles.*
Heaven, Blessedness of believers in, compared to sleep and resting, 432-435; believers in, wait for the resurrection, 449, 468, 472. See *Resurrection.*
Hell, the fear of, often restrains men from sin, 151.
Helvidius, heresy of, 486.
Henry IV., 292.
Heresies, or the reformed opinions, the extirpation of, one object for which the Council of Trent was called, 20, 56, 61, 163; complaints against the clergy for not having extirpated them at their first appearance, 22; decree of Council of Trent as to preachers who may disseminate heresy among the people, 84.
Heretics, the Reformers so regarded by the Council of Trent, 39, 94, 345; doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to, 204, 205; baptism, according to the Interim, not to be repeated when once administered by, 210.
Herod, supposed by some to be meant by the rich man in the parable of Lazarus and the rich man, 431.
Heroism, 370; female, 398.
Hierarchy, Celestial, a work so called ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite, 234, 322.
Hierarchy, Popish, 47.
Hilary, quoted as to the peace of the Church, 240; and as to the state of the Church in his day, 266.
Holy Spirit, decrees of the Council of Trent held by Romanists to have proceeded from, 32, 34, 35, 42; absurdity of this claim, 35, 36, 51, 53, 54, 58, 59, 143; his agency in regeneration, 110; and in begetting faith, 113, 250, 252, 253; error of Council of Trent in maintaining that he acts in us according to the proper disposedness and co-operation of each, 120; seals on the hearts of the godly the certainty of their salvation, 126, 154; insult offered to him by the virtue Papists attribute to chrism in confirmation, 167, 184, 285; is received according to the Adultero-German Interim by the sacrament of confirmation, 211; produces faith in the elect only, 250, 253, 254; his gifts with which Christ was endowed enumerated, 286, 325; water and fire put for, 353; gifts of, conferred by the laying on of the hands of the Apostles, 286; this temporary, 287.
Home put for the body, 442.
Hope of salvation, the Christian's, 137-139.
Hospitals, regulation of the Council of Trent as to, 171.

I

Idolaters, advice to such as live among, 407.
Idolatry, how Papists attempt to meet the charge of, brought against them, 40, 46; warned against, 372, 373; idolatry of the Mass, 383-386, 389; specious but groundless distinction that has been made between Gentile and Popish idolatry, 390-393.
Idols, the worship of, forbidden, 369, 270, 372-375, 379, 404, 407; why flesh offered to, not to be eaten, 373-375; feasts of, 375, 397.
Image of God in which man was at first created, in what it consists, 422-424.
Images, worship of, zeal of Leo the Isaurian against, 75; restored by the Council of Nice, *ib.*; arguments of that Council from Scripture for adorning churches with images and pictures, *ib.*; the kind of worship to be rendered to them, 236, 333, 334; reverence for them not to be expressed by any bodily gesture, 369, 370, 375, 379, 397, 404; worship of them by the Babylonians, 403; we are not to uncover our head before them, 406; gold and silver of graven images were to be regarded by the Jews as unclean, 371.
Immortality of the soul, 427, 438, 449, 453, 460-462, 478.
Impartiality of judgment recommended, 417.
Imputation of Adam's first sin to his posterity, decree of the Council of Trent as to, 78.
Imputation of Christ's righteousness in justification, 115; merit of works confounded with, by the Council of

Trent, 128, 152; justification only from, 244-247, 249; when guilt is effaced sin no longer imputed, 86, 114.
Incense, worship of God designated by, 306.
Indulgences, Popish, ought not to be purchased, 379-381.
Infants, decree of the Council of Trent as to the baptism of, 79; if not baptized excluded from heaven by the Romish Church, 109; (see *Baptism;*) the Lord's Supper anciently administered to, 353.
Infants of believing parents, their salvation if they die in infancy secured by God's promise, though they may die unbaptized, 109, 353-355; born members of the Church and not constituted such by baptism, 110, 347-350.
Innocent III., auricular confession introduced by, 140, 168.
Innocent IV., 170.
Innovation, the dread of, urged as a reason for refusing to disturb any part of the Popish system, 32.
Intercession of departed saints. See *Saints, Departed.*
Interim or declaration of religion of Charles V., for maintaining tranquillity throughout the Germanic empire, 190-239. See *Adultero-German Interim.*
Invocation of departed saints. See *Saints, Departed.*
Irenaeus, quoted in the Adultero-German Interim, in support of the sacrifice of the Mass, 226, 307; quoted as to the continuous succession of bishops, 264; regarded the parable of Lazarus and the rich man as a true history, 431, 468, 478.
Isaac, his anxious care to keep the worship of God untainted, 371; his restoration to his father from death a type of Christ's resurrection, 438.
Isidorus, 336.
Islebius, 314.

J

Jerome, 49, 187; quoted as to the canon of Scripture, 70; called repentance the second plank after shipwreck, 101, 138, 212, 322; regarded the parable of Lazarus and the rich man as a true history, 431, 469.
Jews, The, agitation excited among, when Caius Caligula gave orders to set up his statue in the temple, 342; prohibited from even touching what was unclean, 370; were to regard the gold or silver of graven images as unclean, 371; ultimately worshipped the brazen serpent as an image of the true God, 391.
Jewess and her seven sons, who refused to ransom their lives by tasting swine's flesh, 398.
Joan, Popess, 293.
John, Bishop of Rome, broached the doctrine that the soul dies with the body, and that both will rise again at the last day, 415.
Jonah, his being in the whale's belly a type of Christ's death, 438.
Joy, designated by a white robe, 446.
Judges are called gods, 475.
Judgment, persons sitting in, are to guard against anger and hatred, 26; impartiality of, recommended, 417.
Judgment, Last. See *Day, Last.*
Judith, one of the books of the Apocrypha, 70.
Julian, the apostate, reference to Augustine's treatise against, 150.
Justification, decrees and canons of the Council of Trent as to, 92-108; Popish doctrine as to the increase of, by human satisfactions and good works, 98, 106; this doctrine refuted, 128-130, 158; doctrine of Pelagius as to, 108, 129; is partly by the grace of God, and partly by men's own works, according to the Council of Trent, 104, 108, 151, 152; does not, according to the same Council, merely consist in forgiveness of sins, but includes renovation and sanctification, 95; this doctrine refuted, 114-116, 152; cannot be obtained by works of law, 115, 119, 120, 128, 129; though not the same with sanctification, inseparable from it, 116; simply denotes our gracious acceptance by God, *ib.*; baptism not the instrumental cause of, 96, 116, 117; righteousness of Christ the only ground of, 116-118, 120, 152, 153, 155; faith the instrument of, 118, 124, 125, 151, 153, 155, 249; (see *Faith;*) no merit precedes or follows, 122, 123; is the fruit of God's free grace, 153; doctrine of

the Adultero-German Interim as to, 196-198; inherent righteousness of the justified mixed up in the Interim with the righteousness of Christ in the matter of, 196, 197, 199; refutation of this doctrine, 244, 247, 248; is not to be placed in regeneration, 244, 246; good works a proof of, 247; peace of conscience produced by justification through the imputation of Christ's righteousness alone, 244-247.

K

Kingdom of God, its completion at the last day, 464-466.

Knowledge of God, designated by dreams and visions, 306.

L

Lapsed, The, Popish doctrine as to the recovery of, refuted, 100, 101, 138-141; Popish sacrament of penance not necessary to the recovery of, 107, 160.

Lateran Council, reference to, 66, 89, 167, 168.

Latria and *Dulia*, Popish distinctions of worship, 46, 236, 333.

Law of God, how in it God requires what is above our strength, 113; all men acknowledge their subjection to the curse of, 129; the perfect observance of, impossible in this life, 130-132, 134, 145, 146, 156, 158, 248; perfect obedience necessary to justification by, 129, 132, 134, 248; obedience to it obligatory on believers, 156, 251.

Law and gospel, difference between, 156.

Law, righteousness of faith opposed to righteousness of, 114, 115.

Laying on of hands by the Apostles, the gifts of the Spirit conferred by, 286; regarded by Augustine as but a solemn symbol of prayer, 287; the bestowment of gifts in this way temporary, *ib.*

Laymen, the Reformed Pastors so regarded by the Romish Church, 23, 43; lawful for them to baptize in cases of necessity, according to the Adultero-German Interim, 210.

Lay-preaching condemned, 367.

Lazarus and the rich man, parable of, regarded by Calvin and many of the fathers as a true history, 430-432, 470.

Lazarus. See *Rich.*

Legates of the Pope, their office to preside at General Councils, 58, 61, 163; Legates of the Pope to the Council of Trent, 19. See *Trent, Legate of Pope to Council of.*

Lectureships in monasteries, convents, and schools, 82-90.

Lent, 327.

Leo the Great, Bishop of Rome in the fifth century, 58; quoted as to the election of Bishops, 294.

Leo the Isaurian, his zeal against image worship, 75.

Levitical sacrifices. See *Sacrifices.*

Liberty, Christian, crushed by the Church of Rome, 32, 39, 40, 74; consists in the free use of things indifferent, 45.

Life, Soul sometimes put for, 420, 421, 438. See *Death, Eternal.*

Life which Christ hath bought us, 455, 456.

Litanies, The saying of, enjoined by the Council of Trent, 56, 60.

Living man, A, soul sometimes put for, 421.

Lubin, 321.

Luther, reference to his victory over the Dominican, Ambrosius Catharinus, 48.

Luxury of the Popish clergy, 340.

Lyons, Council of, 168, 170.

Lysander, Saying of, 143.

M

Maccabees, quoted by the Popish Church to prove purgatory and the worship of saints in heaven, 68; and the doctrine of the intercession of departed saints, 231, 317; books of, not inspired, 70, 71, 398, 490.

Man, his condition before the fall, 193; difference between the living soul of man and the living soul of brutes, 451.

Manichees, The, condemned marriage, 220, 337.

Manners, reformation of, one object for the calling of the Council of Trent, 20, 61.

Mantua, Bull of, issued by Pope Pius II., 37.

Marcellinus, reference to Augustine's writing to, 157.

Marcion, Emperor of the East in fifth century, 58, 356.
Marinarius, a Popish priest, his speech at the Council of Trent, 44-47 ; his calumnies against the Reformers, 45, 46.
Marriage, state of, denounced by the Church of Rome as carnal, 76 ; condemned by the Manichees, Tatians, and Encratites, 220; error of the Romish Church in denying that it may be dissolved in cases of adultery, 301 ; consent of parents requisite as to the marriage of their children, 301, 302 ; tyranny of the Church of Rome in forbidding marriage to its priests, 378 ; Protestants not to contract it with those of an opposite religion, 409. See *Celibacy. Manichees. Matrimony.*
Martyrs, opprobrium poured on the memory of, by the Church of Rome, 54 ; a lawful commemoration of, 315, 316 ; do not intercede in heaven for the saints on earth, 316, 317 ; are not to be prayed to, 318, 319 ; fortitude of, 342, 398, 411 ; martyrs under the altar, 445, 446.
Mass, Sacrifice of the, its celebration enjoined every Sabbath by the Council of Trent, 56 ; is an impious profanation of the Lord's Supper, 59, 383 ; doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to, 220-230 ; argument of the Interim for it from Melchisedec's bringing forth bread and wine to Abraham, 227, 228, 305-307; doctrine of the Interim as to joining communion with, 235 ; recommendation of the Interim that the ancient ceremonies should be retained in the celebration of, *ib.* ; and as to the frequency with which it ought to be celebrated, 236 ; the ritual of, founded, according to the Popish Church, on Apostolic tradition, 269 ; refutation of the doctrine of the Interim as to, 302-315; refutation of the arguments derived from Scripture, 303-306; and of the argument derived from the authority of the fathers, 307, 308 ; animadversions on the recommendation of the Interim that the ceremonies of the Mass be continued, 314 ; some of these ceremonies, 314, 315, 360, 386 ; sinfulness of joining in, or being present at the sacrifice of the Mass, 382, 383, 385-387, 397-399, 406 ; extreme reverence in the Popish Church for, 382 ; despoils the death of Christ of its glory, 383, 387; destroys the Lord's Supper as a memorial of Christ's death, 383, 385, 388, 389, 396; idolatry of, 383-386; is "the table of demons," 387, 396; quibbles and excuses by which some who abjured it in their hearts, vindicated their continuing to offer it up or to join in it, 387, 396, 401-404, 406; these quibbles answered, 388-393, 396, 397; suppresses the efficacy of Christ's death, 390; name of God profaned in the service of, 393 ; attendance upon, regarded by the Romish Church as a symbol of the abjurance of the true religion, 397; how far being present at, may be conceded, 403.
Masters, Duty of, as to the pious training of their servants, 408, 409.
Matrimony, maintained to be a sacrament by the Council of Trent, 163; and in the Adultero-German Interim, 208, 217-220; is not a sacrament, 172, 300-302 ; the gross ignorance of Scripture in which the idea of its being a sacrament originated, 301. See *Celibacy. Manichees. Marriage.*
Mauritius, Emperor of the East in the sixth century, 58.
Maximinus, the Arian, reference to Augustine's writing against, 30.
Meats, imposition of the Romish Church on the conscience as to, 45, 60. See *Flesh.*
Medardus, 321.
Mediator between God and man, Christ the only, 320.
Melchisedec, his bringing forth bread and wine to Abraham used as an argument for the sacrifice of the Mass in the Adultero-German Interim, 227, 228 ; this no valid argument, 305-307.
Melciades, Pope, quoted as to baptism and confirmation, 183.
Melito, Bishop of Sardis, reference to his treatise on body and soul, 427.
Merit, not possessed by any, either before or after justification, 122, 123; our deliverance from punishment not owing to our own, 141; nor eternal life to be obtained by our own, 144-146.

Merit, Works of, maintained by the Council of Trent, 107, 162; confounded by the same Council with the free imputation of Christ's righteousness, 128.
Merit of departed saints, doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to, 231, 232; not available to us, 319-321.
Metropolitan or Cathedral Churches, Scripture lectures appointed by the Council of Trent to be delivered in, 81, 90; one man forbidden by the same Council to hold more than one of, 167, 185.
Ministers of the Church, the word and sacraments to be administered only by, 177, 357; doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to, 207. See *Lay-preaching*.
Moderation in defending Christian truth, caution against, 310.
Monasteries, decree of the Council of Trent as to the establishment of Scripture lectureships in, 82; inhospitable to all kinds of liberal study, 90.
Monks, the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent previously concocted by ten or twenty, 34, 50, 128; their venal character, 34, 35; their debates, 35; their impurity, 45, 339, 340, 360.
Montanus, celibacy originated with, 331, 337, 339.
Monti, John Maria de, Cardinal, a legate of the Pope to the Council of Trent, 19; his character, 52, 92.
Mortal sins, cause the loss of the grace received in justification according to the Council of Trent, 101, 102; error of the same Council in recognising only gross and palpable sins as mortal, 106, 107, 144, 159, 204. See *Venial sins*.

N

Naaman, the Syrian, his asking permission of Elisha to worship in the house of Rimmon after his conversion from idols, 401-403.
Name of God profaned in the service of the Mass, 393.
Nantes, Bishop of, sent by France to the Council of Trent, 33; his character, 33, 34.
Neighbour, Our, duty of not giving offence to, 372-375; but we are not to avoid giving offence to, to entice him to idolatry by our example, 405, 406.
Nice, Council of, referred to, 30, 58; restores the worship of images, 75; its arguments from Scripture for adorning churches with images and pictures, *ib.*; deemed holy and lawful by the Popish Church, 75, 267; celibacy of priests mooted in, 331, 338.
Nicolaitans, 338.
Nicolas, Prescription of, as to the election of the Pope disregarded, 294.
Nicolaus, 336.
Novatus quoted, 107, 160.
Nuncios of the Apostolic See, 170.
Nuns, Cloisters of, obscenity in, 45, 302.

O

Obedience, Holy, the reward of eternal life not the only motive to, 162.
Obedience, Perfect, performed by none while in this world, 129-132, 134, 145, 146, 156, 158, 248; required in order to justification by the law, 132, 248.
Oblations, enjoined by the Council of Trent, 100; those of the ancient Church, 308, 311; ancient form of consecrating, 311, 312.
Obsequies of the dead, Celebration of, recommended in the Adultero-German Interim, 237.
Œdipus referred to, 73.
Oil or chrism, virtue attributed to, in the Popish sacrament of confirmation, 167, 211, 285, 288, 380, 387; this an insult to the Holy Spirit, 184, 285; Popish ceremony of anointing with, in baptism, 235, 276; and in making priests, 380, 384. See *Extreme unction*.
Old age, a flourishing, 449.
Oppression of the Christian people by the Church of Rome, 32, 39, 40, 74.
Opus operatum, 164, 175.
Orders, maintained to be a sacrament by the Council of Trent, 163, 164, 176; and in the Adultero-German Interim, 208, 216, 217; is not a sacrament, 291-300.
Ordinaries, Duties required of, by the Council of Trent, for the reformation of the Church, 168, 169.
Ordination of Pastors, 297.
Ordination in the Papacy, 299.
Origen, quoted as to the continuous

succession of bishops, 264, 322; regarded the parable of Lazarus and the rich man as a true history, 431.
Original Sin, decree of the Council of Trent as to, 78; the guilt of, maintained by the same Council to be remitted in baptism, 80; the Virgin Mary maintained by the same Council to be free from, 80, 106, 157; the ordinance of baptism a proof of, 346; was denied by Pelagius, *ib.*; is universal, 348.
Ostiarii, Order of, in the Popish Church, 217, 300.
Ovid quoted, 338.

P

Paedobaptism, 269. See *Baptism.*
Papacy, The, doctrine and whole administration of, at variance with the majority of ancient Councils, 32; gross ignorance and barbarous ferocity of the Councils in authority with, 33; corruption of the doctrine of repentance under, 143, 175; misapplication of Church property under, 185; advice to such as live among the adherents of, 407. See *Adultero-German Interim. Popish Church. Trent, Council of.*
Papal Bull calling the Council of Trent, 20.
Paphnutius, the martyr, opposes the celibacy of priests in the Council of Nice, 331, 338.
Papists. See *Romanists,* &c.
Parables, nature of, 432.
Parents, consent of, requisite as to the marriage of their children, 301, 302; ought not to neglect to have their children baptized, 354, 355.
Parents, Believing, the salvation of their children who die in infancy unbaptized secured by God's promise, 109, 353-355; their children born members of the Church and not constituted such by baptism, 110, 275; ground on which their children are baptized, 275.
Parsons, Parochial, bound by the Council of Trent to preach, 83.
Passions of anger and hatred to be guarded against by persons met for deliberation and judgment, 26.
Pastors, Abuses of, reference to a book so called, 23.
Pastors, Popish priests unworthy of the name of, 43; how elected in apostolic times, 296; ordination of, 297; Popish Church makes priests and not pastors, *ib.*; an ordinary call requisite in ordinary times to the admission of any to the office of, *ib.*; the Church would not cease though without, 297, 298.
Patriarchs, The, their anxious care to keep the worship of God untainted, 371.
Patrimony of the Popish Church, 336. See *Church property.*
Patron saints, 320, 321.
Paul, the Apostle, his vow as to shaving his head, 404, 426; his walking round the Athenian altars, 394; kept himself at the farthest distance from idolatry, 394, 395.
Paul III., Pope, reluctant to call the Council of Trent, and delays calling it, 31, 37; causes alleged in his Bull for this delay fictious, 31; his three legates to the Council, 19, 32; nothing done in the Council save at his nod, 35; is ironically compared to Aristarchus, 36; his primacy described, 48; eulogium pronounced on him in the Council of Trent by Bishop Cornelius, 51-53; his wicked character, 52, 76, 92; his cruelty, 314. See *Pope.*
Peace of the Church. See *Church, Peace of.*
Peace of believers on receiving the gospel, 433; a higher peace to be enjoyed by them in heaven, 433-435, 467.
Pelagians, The, referred to, 85, 131.
Pelagius, held man's justification by his own righteousness, 108, 129; denied original sin, 346; deemed the baptism of infants superfluous, 346, 349.
Penance, Popish sacrament of, maintained by the Council of Trent to have been instituted by Christ, 101, 138, 139, 182; doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to, 208, 212; is not a sacrament, 289.
People, Christian, their liberty crushed by the Church of Rome, 32.
People of God, the knowledge of their election to eternal life and of their final perseverance denied by the Council of Trent to be attainable by, 100, 105; this knowledge attainable, 135-139, 155; the full punishment of their sins borne by

Christ, 141, 142 ; are chastised by God, 142, 161; faith not altogether extinguished by their sins, 144 ; their good works tainted by sin, 146 ; cannot perfectly obey the law of God in this life, 98, 99, 105 ; in what sense they are said to be righteous by works, 248 ; benevolent ministry of angels towards, 318; their obligation to advance God's glory and the good of mankind, 368.
Perfection, unattainable by the best of men in the present state, 130-132, 134, 158.
Permission of sin, Popish doctrine as to, 104 ; God acts not merely permissively in reference to the sins of men, 149.
Persecuting character of Popery, 38.
Perseverance in a state of grace, that God's people may attain the certainty of their, denied by the Council of Trent, 100, 105 ; the certain knowledge of this attainable, 136-139, 155.
Peter, the Apostle, the Pope denied to be the successor of, 265 ; supremacy over the whole Church not granted by Christ to, 270, 271 ; that he was Bishop of Rome fabulous, 272.
Pharisees, The, 426.
Philosophers, Heathen, their inadequate ideas as to the human soul, 420.
Phrygians, The, 356.
Picart, Francis, his school, 34.
Pius II., Pope, his Bull of Mantua referred to, 37.
Plato, reference to his discourses as to the human soul, 420.
Poets, Heathen, quoted, 417, 451, 459.
Pole, Reginald, a legate of the Pope to the Council of Trent, 19 ; his character, 52.
Polycarp, his excellent character, 426; quoted in proof of the existence of spirit, 427.
Polygamy, 217, 218.
Pontiff, Roman, doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to the supremacy of, 207 ; refutation of this doctrine, 270-274. See *Peter. Pope. Roman See.*
Poor, The, neglect of, by the Popish Church, 43 ; the giving of alms to, enjoined by the Council of Trent, 56.
Pope, The, subserviency of the monks to, 34 ; reformation of the Church not to be expected from, 38 ; not the Vicar of Christ, 49-51, 58 ; tyranny of, 89, 273; doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to the supremacy of, 207 ; and its refutation, 270-274 ; is the extinguisher of the light of the gospel and profaner of God's worship, 274, 378 ; prescription of Nicolas as to the election of, disregarded by the Cardinals, 294. See *Paul III. Peter.*
Popes, Anti, three, 292.
Popess, Joan, 293.
Popish baptism, valid, 351.
Popish Bishops. See *Bishops, Popish.*
Popish Church, The, ministers of, blamed for not having extirpated the reformed opinions at their first appearance, 22 ; decay of discipline in, 23 ; peace of, disturbed by the wars occasioned by the Reformation, *ib.* ; charges the Reformers with plundering the property of, 23, 336 ; (See *Church Property ;*) regards the reformed pastors as laymen, 23, 43 ; crushes the liberty of the Christian people, 32, 39 ; the doctrine of salvation adulterated by, 38, 39 ; the sacraments corrupted and prostituted by, 38, 39, 179 ; persecuting character of, 38; points in dispute between it and the Reformers prejudged in the admonition of the Pope's legates to the Council of Trent, 39, 40; idolatries and superstitions of, 40; neglect of the poor and teachers of schools by, 43 ; fetters the conscience by traditions, 45, 166, 181; vows of, 45, 166, 182 ; imposition on the conscience as to meats by, *ib.* ; charges of idolatry brought against, how met by, 46; hierarchy of, 47; places traditions and the Apocrypha on a level with the word of God, 64, 65, 67-70; endeavours to prove purgatory and the worship of saints from the book of Maccabees, and from the Scriptures, 68, 69; and satisfactions and exorcisms from Tobit, 68; claims to itself the sole right of determining the sense of Scripture, 68, 69, 74, 76, 286; denounces the state of marriage as carnal life, *ib.* ; doubting faith of, 125, 126 ; maintains that by suffering men merit eternal life, 133; vigils, alms, prayers, oblations, and fastings enjoined by, 100; denies justification

by faith alone, 144; holds that the human will has still some freedom left to choose good, 93, 94, 104, 108-112, 148; denies that effectual calling is limited to the elect, 105, 155; is not the mistress and mother of all churches, 165, 180; the seven sacraments of, 208-220, 274, 275; (see *Sacraments, Confirmation, Extreme unction, Orders, Penance,* and *Matrimony;*) its doctrine as to the commemoration, intercession, invocation, and merits of departed saints, 46, 230-232; (see *Saints, departed.*) And as to praying for the dead, 232-234; ceremonies used in baptism by, 235; vigils and obsequies of the dead celebrated by, 237; feast days of, *ib.*; interdicts the eating of flesh on certain days, 237, 238; clerical celibacy of, 45; (see *Celibacy of the Popish clergy;*) maintains the doctrine of transubstantiation, 214, 277-282; (see *Transubstantiation;*) Withholds the cup from the laity, 282-284; falsely assumes the name of *the* Church, 286; Simony practised in, to obtain elevation to the episcopate, 294; distinguishes sins into venial and mortal, 99, 101, 102, 106, 107, 132-134, 144, 159, 160, 166, 182, 204. See *Adultero-German Interim. Trent, Council of. Romanists.*

Popish Clergy, The, blamed as having caused the Reformation by their ambition, avarice, and passions, 22-24; are called upon by the Pope's legates to the Council of Trent to repentance and self-condemnation, 24-28; celibacy of, 45; (see *Celibacy of the Popish Clergy;*) persecuting character of, 54; decree of Council of Trent as to the reformation of their manners, 56; their ignorance in Calvin's time, 76; their impurities, 43, 44, 184, 185, 295, 339, 340, 360; their extravagance and luxury, 340; their avarice, 380. See *Priests, Popish.*

Popish idolatry, specious but groundless distinction made between it and Gentile idolatry, 390-393.

Popish Sacraments. See *Confirmation, Penance,* &c.

Popish superstitions, Gentile not worse than, 378.

Posterity of Adam. See *Adam.*

Prayer enjoined by the Council of Trent as a satisfaction for sin, 100, 101, 139, 141, 142, 213; refutation of the Popish doctrine on this head, 160, 258, 259; unless founded on the word of God is not legitimate, 316, 320, 324; is not to be addressed to departed saints, 318, 319; doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to praying for the dead, 232-234; 321, 322; this doctrine not supported by Scripture, 323-325.

Prayer to departed saints. See *Saints.*

Preachers who may disseminate error or scandals among the people, law of the Council of Trent as to, 84.

Preaching, bishops, archbishops, primates, and other prelates bound by the Council of Trent to perform this duty, 83; curates and other inferior clergy bound by the same Council to perform it, *ib.*; regulars to be tried before being allowed to preach, 84; eleemosynary quaestors not allowed to preach, 85.

Preaching, Lay, condemned, 367.

Preaching to the spirits in prison by Christ, what, 428, 429.

Prebendaries, decree of Council of Trent as to their being compelled to expound the Scriptures, 81, 89.

Predestination. See *Election.*

Presbyters, Order of, in the Popish Church, 217.

Priests, Popish, unworthy of the name of pastors, 43; a simple priest may not administer the sacrament of confirmation, 167, 184; absolution by, in the sacrament of penance, 212, 213; their offering Christ in the Mass, 291, 296, 312; ceremony of chrism in making, 380, 384. See *Popish clergy. Celibacy.*

Priestesses of Apollo, allusion to, 35.

Priscillians, The, 356.

Prison, preaching to the spirits in, by Christ, explained, 428, 429.

Promises of God, Relation between faith and, 251.

Prophets, The, legates of the Pope to the Council of Trent personate, 41; usual with them to figure spiritual things by visible symbols, 453.

Protestants, The, patrimony of the Romish Church obtained by, 336; their pastors regarded as laymen by the Papacy, 23, 43.

Proverbs, 34, 53, 67, 69, 353, 408, 417.

Psalmody in the church recommended in the Adultero-German Interim, 237.

Punishment, the remission of the eternal, through Christ's satisfaction, and of the temporal, by human satisfactions, a distinction of the Papacy, 101, 107, 141, 160, 213, 258, 259; the full punishment of his people's sins borne by Christ, 141, 142.
Purgatory, attempts of the Popish Church to prove it from the Maccabees, 68; and from the Scriptures, 69, 107; receives no support from Scripture, 161; reference to, 233, 323, 325.
Pusillanimity or cowardice in professing the truth of Christ censured, 361-365, 401.

R

Readers, order of, in the Popish Church, 217.
Redemption by Christ, doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim, as to, 195.
Reformation of the Church, was not to be expected from the Council of Trent, 38, 40; promised by Charles V., 193; decrees of the Council of Trent for, 167-171; antidote to these decrees, 185-188; duties required by the Council from ordinaries for, 168, 169.
Reformation of manners, one object for which the Council of Trent was called, 20.
Reformation of the 16th century, how characterized in the admonition of the Pope's legate to the Council of Trent, 22, 23; Romish clergy by their ambition, avarice, and passions, blamed as the cause of, 22-24; wars occasioned by, 23.
Reformed pastors, regarded as laymen by the Romish Church, 23, 43.
Reformers, The, their opinions branded as heresies by the Papacy, 20, 56, 61; the extirpation of these heresies one object of the calling of the Council of Trent, 20, 56, 61; falsely charged with plundering the property of the Church, 23, 43; points in dispute between them and the Romish Church prejudged in the admonition of the Pope's legates to the Council of Trent, 39, 40; their liberality in supporting schools, 43; and the poor, *ib.*; calumnies of the Romanists against, 45-47; renounced Popish vows, 45; and celibacy, *ib.*; and the worship of departed saints, 46; estimate formed of the Council of Trent by, 47; light cast upon Scripture by, 76.
Regenerate, The, concupiscence, or the motions of sin in, decreed by the Council of Trent not to be sin, 80; are delivered from the guilt of sin though not exempt from blame, 85, 86; sin exists in them so long as they are in this world, 88, 129; do not and cannot perfectly obey the law in the present state, 130-132, 134.
Regeneration, The grace of, exhibited in baptism, 86; agency of the Holy Spirit in, 110, 111; not a part of justification, 114-117; not perfected in this life, 156; justification not to be placed in, 244; regeneration and justification inseparable, 118, 246.
Regeneration, Baptismal, decree of Council of Trent as to, 79.
Regulars, ordained by a decree of the Council of Trent to be tried before being allowed to preach, 84.
Religion, not to be profaned by superstitions, 371; impure and impious rites in, *ib.*; dogmatism in matters of, condemned, 417; uniformity in, required by Charles V. in the Germanic States, 192.
Remission of sins exhibited in baptism, 86. See *Forgiveness of sins.*
Renewed part of our nature, spirit often put for, 422. See *Regeneration.*
Renunciation, ceremony of, used in Popish baptism, 235.
Repentance, called by Jerome, the second plank after shipwreck, 101, 138; error of Papists in mantaining that it is not genuine without auricular confession, 140, 141; satisfaction by fasting, alms, and prayer, no part of, 141; God inflicts chastisement on his people to bring them to, 142; nature of, as described in Scripture, 143; corruption of the doctrine of, under the Papacy, 143, 175; necessity of, not denied by the Reformers when they make faith the instrument of justification, 154, 155.
Resting, blessedness of believers in heaven compared to, 432-435.
Resurrection, Christ's rising from the dead the only ground of the hope of, 436; is promised, 440; is hoped

for by God's people on earth, 466, 472; and by the saints in heaven, 449, 468; objection to, answered, 451; denied by the Sadducees, 471; argument for, 472.
Resurrection, a twofold, described in the Apocalypse, 446.
Reward, the application of this term to good works does not infer merit in them, 135, 248; reward of eternal life not the only motive to holy obedience, 162.
Rich man and Lazarus, Parable of, regarded by Calvin and many of the ancient fathers as a true history, 430, 431.
Righteousness of Christ, the only ground of our justification, 116-118, 120, 152, 153, 244-247; inherent righteousness, added to, by the Papacy in the matter of justification, 196, 197, 199; erroneousness of this doctrine, 244-247. See *Imputation.*
Righteousness of faith opposed to the righteousness of the law, 114, 115, 181.
Righteousness of works, meaning of the phrase, 248. See *Works, Good.*
Rites, Popish, used in the administration of the sacraments confirmed by the Council of Trent, 165, 178.
Robe, White, put for glory, festivity, and joy, 446.
Roman people, Cato's address to, urging them to correct their extravagant expenditure, 18.
Roman Pontiff. See *Pontiff, Roman. Pope. Roman See.*
Roman See, its tyranny, 89, 273, 274, 378; its authority left unimpaired by the Council of Trent, 167, 186, 187; nuncios of, 170; twice abandoned by almost all Germany before the Reformation, 292. See *Pontiff, Roman. Pope.*
Romanists, blind ambition, obstinacy, and impiety of, 18; maintain that the decrees of General Councils proceed from the Holy Spirit, 32, 34, 35, 42; acknowledged at Council of Trent that the calamities of the Church were attributable to themselves, 23, 24, 38; their sacrilege in opposing the word of God, 44; their calumnies against the Reformers, 45-47. See *Popish Church.*
Rome, Bishop of, his claim to the appellation of Universal Bishop opposed by Gregory the Great, 49; the title of general or highest bishop not conceded to him by the Africans, *ib.*; that Peter was bishop of, fabulous, 272. See *Pope.*
Ruffinus quoted as to the canon of Scripture, 70.

S

Sabbath, curates and other inferior clergy bound by the Council of Trent to preach on, 83.
Sacrament, nature of, 172, 373. See *Baptism*, &c.
Sacraments, The, corrupted and prostituted by the Papacy, 38, 39; seven, held by the Council of Trent, 163; canons of that Council on, 163-165; 172, 173; antidote to the canons on, 171-179; (see *Confirmation, Extreme unction, Orders, Matrimony,* and *Penance;*) are maintained by the same Council to be unequal in dignity, 164, 173, and to be necessary to salvation, 164; their proper connection with salvation stated, 174; according to the Council of Trent are efficacious without faith, 164, 174-176; and confer grace *ex opere operato*, 164, 175; impiety of this doctrine, 176; God alone properly acts in and by, *ib.*; are to be administered only by ministers ordained for that purpose, 177; their efficacy made by the Council of Trent to depend on the intention of the priest who administers them, 164; absurdity of this doctrine, 177; Popish rites used in administering them confirmed by the same Council, 165, 178; doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to, 208-220; to be legitimate must be of Divine institution, 269, 275; design of the institution of, 274; refutation of the doctrine of the Interim as to, 274-302.
Sacrifices of Cain and Abel, 221, 222.
Sacrifices, Levitical, Cyprian quoted as to, 221; purposes for which they were instituted, 222-225, 310, 311.
Sacrifices prevalent among the Gentiles, 224.
Sacrifice of Christ, 220-230. See *Christ*, &c.
Sacrifice of the Mass. See *Mass.*
Sacrifices which are still approved of by God, 306.

Sadducees, denied the existence of spirit, 426, 445, and the resurrection, 471.
Saints, patron, 320, 321.
Saints, Departed, the worship of, repudiated by the Reformers, 46; the worship of, forbidden by the Council of Carthage, 60; the worship of, practised by the Romish Church, 60, 69; doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to the commemoration, intercession, invocation, and merits of, 230-232; a lawful commemoration of, 315, 316; the intercession of, without authority from Scripture, 316, 317; are not to be prayed to, 318, 319; merits of, not available to us, 319-321.
Salii, The, banquet of, 384.
Salvation, the doctrine of, adulterated by the Romish Church, 38, 39; full assurance of, attainable by believers in the present state, 105, 125-127, 136-139, 154, 155; baptism of infants not absolutely necessary to their salvation as maintained by Papists, 165, 180, 275, 347-351, 353, 354.
Samaritans, The, mixed a depraved worship of the true God with the worship of false gods, 393.
Sanctification, not a part of justification, 114-116; sanctification and justification inseparable, 116, 117.
Satisfactions for sin by fasting, almsgiving, prayer, &c., as held by Papists, 68, 101, 139, 141, 213; Popish doctrine that human satisfactions remit the temporal punishment of sin, though not the eternal, 101, 141; this doctrine refuted, 141-143, 161, 258, 259.
Scandals, decree of the Council of Trent as to preachers who may disseminate them among the people, 84.
Schismatics, doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to, 204, 205.
Schools, not supported and encouraged by the Popish Church, 43; supported and encouraged by the Reformers, *ib.*
Schools, Public, decree of the Council of Trent as to the establishment of Scripture lectureships in, 82, 91.
Scriptures, Holy, decrees of the Council of Trent as to, that they are to be read at the tables of bishops, 56; that they are insufficient without traditions, 64, 67; that the Vulgate is the only authentic version of, 65, 67, 68; that none are to interpret them contrary to the sense of the Church and the unanimous consent of the fathers, 66, 74, 76; restraints laid on the printing and circulation of, 66; bishops, archbishops, and primates, enjoined to compel prebendaries to expound them, 81.
Scriptures, Holy, importance of studying them in the original tongues, 68, 71; attempts of the Popish Church to establish confession, the intercession of departed saints and purgatory from, 69; are the only rule of faith, 70; opinions of the fathers as to the canonical books of, *ib.*; light thrown by the Reformers upon, 76; erroneous interpretations of, by the Council of Trent, 110, 153; are not to be submitted to the authority of the Church, 267; the Apocrypha not to be received as a part of the canon of, 267; the exclusive right of judging of their true sense does not belong to the Church, 267, 268, 286; searching them recommended, 417; reprehensible mode of searching them, 417, 418.
Scripture lectureships, decree of Council of Trent as to the establishment of, in monasteries, convents, and public schools, 82, 90.
See, a vacant, regulation of Council of Trent as to the chapter filling up, 170.
Security, sleep used in Hebrew for, 435.
Self-denial, 366.
Septuagint, The, Vulgate translated from, 73.
Servants, duty of masters as to the pious training of, 408, 409.
Servetus, 337.
Sick, The, Popish sacrament of extreme unction administered only to, 215, 216.
Sign of the Cross. See *Cross.*
Simony practised by the Romish Church to obtain elevation to the episcopate, 294, 295.
Sin, is no longer imputed when its guilt is once effaced, 86, 114; Popish doctrine as to God's permission of, 104; holy fear of falling into, enjoined, 137; God acts not merely permissively in reference to, 149; abstinence from, from the fear of hell no proof of hatred of, 151;

faith not extinguished by the sins of God's people, 144.
Sin, Original. See *Original sin.*
Sin of our depraved nature, body put for, 439.
Sixtus IV., Pope, his constitutions as to the freedom of the Virgin Mary from original sin, 86.
Sleep, blessedness of believers at and after death compared to, 432, 434, 435, 458, 459; used in Hebrew for security and confidence of any kind, 435; death of impious kings compared to, 458.
Sons of God, 466.
Sorbonne at Paris, Doctors of, their contempt for the fathers of the Council of Trent, 35, 179, 256, 298, 308, 334, 336, 341.
Sorbonists. See *Sorbonne.*
Sosia, a notorious Parisian, 33.
Sotus, a Popish priest, his speech at the Council of Trent, 44.
Soul, Human, Plato and Aristotle's inadequate views as to, 420; is distinct from the body, 425-427; survives the dissolution of the body, 427-432; its rest, when in sure trust in the Divine promise it is freed from the body, 432-436, 449, 450; God the life of, 441; the body the prison of, 443; state of the souls of the wicked between death and the last judgment, 450. See *Body. Immortality.*
Soul, Human, error of such as hold that it dies or sleeps between death and the last judgment, 413, 414, 419; many drawn to embrace this error, 414; its advocates circulate it in tracts, 414, 415; originated with some Arabs, 415; revived by the Anabaptists, *ib.*; arguments disproving it, 436-438; arguments by which its defenders support it refuted, 450-490.
Soul, faith termed by Augustine the life of, 119, 159; is sometimes put for life, 420, 438; sometimes for a living man, 421; sometimes for breath, *ib.*; sometimes for the will, 422.
Souls of the just, receptacle for, between death and last judgment, 468, 469; do not reach their final perfection until the day of judgment, 470.
Sozomen quoted, 331.
Speculator, Abbot of Panormia, 336.
Spirit, the existence of, denied by the Sadducees, 426; the belief of, held firmly among the Apostles, *ib.* See *Holy.*
Spirit, is often put for the renewed part of our nature, 422, 440; sometimes means intellect, 422.
Spirits in prison, what is meant by Christ's preaching to, 428, 429.
Spiritual things, usual for the Prophets to figure them by visible symbols, 453.
Stipend, why not taken by Paul from the Corinthians, 262.
Stephen, Bishop of Rome, called to order, and charged with error, ignorance, and obstinacy by Cyprian, 49.
Succession of Bishops in the Romish Church, Apostolic, 205, 264, 265, 291-299.
Supererogation, doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to, 201; refutation of this doctrine, 261, 262.
Superstitions, Popish, 40, 360; cloaked by traditions, 70; religion not to be profaned by, 371, 374, 393; fellowship with, forbidden, 393, 394, 403, 404, 406; Gentile superstitions not worse than Popish, 376.
Supper, Lord's, Sacrament of, instituted by Christ, 173; is efficacious only by faith, 174-176; God alone properly acts in and by, 176; the simplicity of its administration corrupted by Popish rites, 165, 178; Popish doctrine which makes its efficacy depend on the intention of the priest who administers it, 164; absurdity of this doctrine, 177; doctrine of Adultero-German Interim as to, 208, 213, 214; and as to joining communion with the sacrifice of the Mass, 235; recommendation and doctrine of the Interim as to communion under both species, 192, 239, 283, 284; design of the institution of, 274; spiritual meaning of, 277; the bread and wine in, not changed into the body and blood of Christ after the consecration of the priest, 214, 277-282; (see *Transubstantiation;*) Popish doctrine of adoring Christ in the bread of, 280-282; the fathers deviated from the pure institution of, 308; was administered in old times to infants, 353; error of

Augustine in maintaining that those who have not received it perish, 355; is destroyed as a memorial of Christ's death by the Mass, 383, 385, 388, 389, 396; Christ present, in only spiritually, 384; divinely instituted ceremonies of, 388. See *Mass, Sacrifice of.*

Swine's flesh, Eleazar and a Jewess with her seven sons, refuse to ransom their lives by tasting, 398.

T

Tapers in Popish churches, worship of *latria* not to be rendered to, 236, 269, 276.

Tatians, The, condemned marriage, 220.

Temple, worship of God designated by the term, 306.

Tertullian, quoted in the Adultero-German Interim in support of praying for the dead, 234; quoted in opposition to women administering baptism, 356; and in support of the existence of spirit, 427; regarded the parable of Lazarus and the rich man as a true history, 431, 468.

Theophylact, quoted in the Adultero-German Interim in support of the sacrifice of the Mass, 228, 230.

Theodosius II., Emperor of the East, 58.

Thief upon the cross, Christ's promise to, 446-448.

Timidity in professing the truths of Christ censured, 361-365.

Tobit, Book of, attempt of the Popish Church to prove satisfactions and exorcisms from, 68; not inspired, 70.

Toulouse, Council of, 56.

Traditions, put on a level with the word of God by the Council of Trent, 64, 67-70; and in the Adultero-German Interim, 206, 207, 268; curse pronounced on such as do not receive, 65; a means by which the Popish Church enslaves the conscience, 70, 278; and by which she cloaks and supports her superstitions, 70, 96, 129, 163, 166, 181, 233, 234; baptism of infants has not its origin in, 269; Popish traditions without authority, 268, 269.

Training. See *Domestic.*

Transubstantiation, Doctrine of, maintained in the Adultero-German Interim, 214; refutation of, 277-282; was never dreamed of till more than six hundred years after the Christian era, 278; fierceness of the Popish Church on, 279, 383, 384.

Trent, Legates of Pope to Council of, 19; their admonition to the Council, 19-30; anticipate difficulties to it, 19; their reference to the Papal Bull calling it, and to the objects for which it was called, 20-23, 56, 61; blame the clergy for not extirpating the reformed opinions at their first appearance, 22, 23; and for having, by their ambition, avarice, and passions, caused the Reformation, 23, 24; their hypocritical professions of repentance for the sins of the Church, 24-28, 42; personate the Prophets, 41; their character, 52; antidote to their admonition, 38-54.

Trent, Council of, very different from the ancient Councils of the Church, 31; demanded by the common voice of Christendom, *ib.*; little to be hoped for from, 37, 40; the Pope reluctant to call, and delays calling, 31, 32, 37; (see *Paul III.*;) small number and worthless character of the Bishops who composed it, 33, 34, 37, 63; the decrees of, previously concocted by ten or twenty monks, 34-36, 50; its decisions held to have proceeded from the Holy Spirit, 34-36, 54, 58, 59; its Fathers held in contempt by the doctors of the Sorbonne, 35; why its decisions were applauded by the various schools in Europe, *ib.*; no free discussion in, 36, 37, 39, 40; speeches of some members of, 44-54; falsely called a Universal Council, 57; the object of, to blind the eyes of the simple, 90, 91; anathemas of, 85, 147; erroneous interpretations of Scripture by, 110; upheld the entire authority of the Apostolic See, 167, 186, 187.

Trent, Decrees of Council of, decree enjoining fasting on Friday, almsgiving, celebrating Mass, saying of litanies, and reforming the manners of the clergy, 55-57; antidote to this decree, 57-60; decree expressing adherence to the creed as in missal, 61, 62; remarks on this decree, 63; decree putting tradi-

tions and the Apocrypha on a level with the inspired writings, 64, 65, 67; decree declaring the Vulgate to be the only authentic version of the Scriptures, 65, 67, 68; barbarousness of this decree, 71-74; decree forbidding any to interpret the Scriptures contrary to the sense of the Church and the unanimous consent of the Fathers, and imposing restraints on the printing and circulation of the Scriptures and expositions upon them, 66; arrogance of the Church's claim of exclusive right to interpret the Scriptures, 74, 76; decree as to infant baptism and baptismal regeneration, 79; as to the remission of the guilt of original sin being conferred and the proper nature of sin wholly taken away in baptism, 80, 85, 86; as to concupiscence or the motions of sin which remain in the regenerate after baptism not being sin, 80, 87, 88; and as to the decree respecting original sin not including the Virgin Mary, 80; decree enjoining bishops, archbishops, and primates to compel prebendaries to expound the Scriptures, 81, 89; and relating to lectureships on the Scriptures, in metropolitan or cathedral churches, in monasteries, convents, and public schools, 81, 82, 90, 91; and requiring the clergy, from the highest to the lowest, to preach, 83; law as to preachers who may disseminate error or scandals among the people, 84; decrees and canons as to justification, 92-107; canons as to the sacraments in general, 163-165; as to baptism, 165, 166; as to confirmation, 167; and as to reformation, 167-171.

Trent, Doctrines of the Council of, particularly refuted, that the human will has still some power left to choose good, 93, 94, 104, 108, 109, 147-149; (See *Free will*;) that men are justified partly by the grace of God and partly by their own works, 96, 108; that there is no transference to a state of grace without baptism, 109, 110; that unbaptized infants are excluded from heaven, 109, 110; that the grace of God, in preparing us for receiving justification, performs only the office of exciting and assisting, we ourselves co-operating, 94, 110-112; that justification not merely consists in the forgiveness of sins, but includes regeneration and sanctification, 94, 95, 114-116; that baptism is the instrumental cause of justification, 95, 96, 116, 117; that faith may be distinguished into informal and formed, 96, 118, 119; that the Spirit of God acts in us according to the proper disposedness and co-operation of each, 120; that it is only the commencement of justification that is to be ascribed to faith, 97, 122; that believers cannot attain the full assurance of their being forgiven, 97, 105, 125, 126; that justification admits of increase by increased mortifications and good works, 98, 106, 128-130, 154, 158; that the perfect observance of the divine law by believers is possible in the present state, 98, 99, 105, 131, 132, 156; that it is heresy to maintain that the pious sin in every good work at least venially, 98, 99, 106, 134, 158; that it is impossible for God's people to attain the knowledge of their election to eternal life, 100, 105, 136-139, 155; and the certainty of their final perseverance; 100, 105, 136-139, 155; that vigils, almsgiving, and fasting are a satisfaction for sin, 100, 101; that penance is a sacrament instituted by Christ, 101, 138, 139; that it is only by the sacrament of penance that the baptized can be reinstated in grace, 101, 160; that after the remission of the liability to eternal punishment the liability to temporal punishment remains, 101, 160; that by any mortal sin the grace received in justification is lost, but not faith, 101, 102; that auricular confession and satisfaction of works are a part of repentance, 139-141; that mortal sins are limited to such as are gross and palpable, 144; that good works merit eternal life, 102, 103, 106, 107, 128, 144, 145, 158, 162; that believers in this life may satisfy the law and merit eternal life, 145, 146; that the Romish Church is the mother and mistress of all Churches, 165, 180; the Council's doctrine as to the nature of

justifying faith refuted, 105, 153, 154; antidote to the canons on the sacraments in general; 171-179; antidote to the canons on baptism, 179-183; and to the canons on confirmatian, 183-185; and to the canons on reformation, 185-188.
Truth of Christ, the only bond of peace, 240; caution against moderation in the defence of, 310; consistency in confessing it enjoined, 341-343; timidity in professing it censured, 361-365, 376, 377; dissembling our convictions as to it censured, 362, 363, 366; has only one voice, 417; its adulteration in the smallest degree not to be tolerated, 418.
Tutelar deities, 395.
Tyranny of the Roman See. See *Roman See.*
Tyrants can only injure the body, 427, 428.

U

Unbelief, all sins flow from, 159.
Unbelievers, doctrine of the Council of Trent that they receive the grace which is offered in the sacraments, 175; all intercourse with them not forbidden to Christians, 374; their superstitions not to be joined in, 375.
Unclean, the Jews prohibited from even touching what was so, 370.
Unction. See *Extreme.*
Unity, Catholic, doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to, 202-204; is a mark of the true Church according to the Interim, 205; no unity except in Christ, 416.
Universal Bishop. See *Bishop. Pope.*

V

Vacant See, rules for filling up, 170.
Valentinian, Emperor of the West in the fifth century, 58.
Valla, reference to his animadversions on the errors of the Vulgate, 74.
Venial sins, distinguished by the Romish Church from mortal, 99, 106, 107, 132-134, 160, 166, 182; no sins light, 133, 134, 159. See *Mortal sins.*
Verus, Marcus Antonius, 322.
Vicar of Christ, falsehood of the Pope's pretensions to this distinction, 49.
Vienna, Council of, 171.
Vigils, the celebration of, enjoined by the Council of Trent, 100; and in the Adultero-German Interim, 237; vigils for the dead not to be retained in the Church, 325.
Virgin Mary, declared by the Council of Trent to have been appointed our advocate, 48; and to have been free from original sin, and immaculate, 80, 106, 157; Augustine, Chrysostom, and Ambrose, quoted in proof that she was a sinner, 157, 158, 356.
Virginity, not a virtue in itself, 262. See *Celibacy.*
Visions, knowledge of God designated by, 306.
Vows, Popish, 45, 166, 182; vows of celibacy, 302; mental vows, 404; Paul's vow as to shaving his head, *ib.*
Vulgate, decree of Council of Trent declaring it to be the only authentic version of the Scripture, 65, 67, 68; barbarousness of this decree, 71; teems with innumerable errors, *ib.*; specimens of its errors, 72-74; was translated from the Septuagint, 73; a mistake in reading a passage in it led to the ranking of matrimony among the sacraments, 301.

W

Wars occasioned by the Reformation, 23.
Water, put for the Holy Spirit, 353; sprinkling of water that has been consecrated by exorcisms unlawful, 379, 381.
Water, Lustral, its power to expel demons, according to the Popish Church, 333.
White robe put for glory, festivity, and joy, 446.
Wicked, The, state of the souls of, between death and the last judgment, 450.
Will, human, rendered incapable by the fall of Adam of choosing good, 108, 109; is formed by God to choose good, 110-113; 121; 148, 149. See *Free will.*
Will-worship, 263, 270. See *Worship of God.*
Wisdom of Solomon, one of the Apocryphal books, 70, 424.
Women, Holy heroism of, 342, 343, 398; allowed by the Council of Trent to

administer baptism, 177; ought in no cases to administer it, 353, 355; animadversions on an attack upon Calvin for denying their right to do so, 344, 346, 352; are prohibited from administering it by the Council of Carthage, 356; fathers quoted in opposition to women doing so, *ib.*; Zipporah's circumcising her son no argument for this practice, 356-358.

Word of God, duty to be measured by the rule of, 406; sacrilege of the Popish Church in opposing, 44. See *Scriptures.*

Works, Good, merit of, maintained by the Council of Trent, 102, 106, 107, 158, 162; this doctrine refuted, 144-146; justification cannot be obtained by, 115, 116, 119, 120, 128, 129; believers ought to make daily increase in, 128; are tainted by sins in the best in the present state, 134, 145, 146; application of the term reward to, does not imply any merit in, 135, 141; necessity of, 144, 246, 247; error of the Council of Trent in making assurance of salvation depend on the view of, 146; must proceed from faith as their root, 150; doctrine of the Adultero-German Interim as to, 199-201; a proof of justification, 247; reward of, not paid by way of debt, 248; Popish satisfactions by, 139, 141.

Works, Righteousness of, meaning of the phrase, 248. See *Merits.*

Worship of God, importance of standing up in defence of the right mode of, 243, 260; must be spiritual, and have for its only rule the will of God, 260-263; David's dancing before the ark gives no support to fictitious modes of, 262; designated by the terms altar, sacrifice, and temple, 306; anxious care of Isaac and Jacob to keep it untainted, 371. See *Will-worship.*

Worship of idols and images forbidden, 369, 370, 372-375, 379; practised by the Babylonians, 403. See *Images, Worship of.*

Y

Yesterday, put for eternal duration. 448.

Z

Zipporah, her circumcising her son used by Romanists as an argument for women administering baptism, 356, 357; this argument refuted, 357, 358.

TEXTS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

ILLUSTRATED OR QUOTED.

GENESIS.

Chap.	Ver.	Page
i.	21	450
	26	193
		422
	27	193
ii.	17	453
	23	220
vii.	15	450
xv.	1	463
	6	122
xvii.	7	110
		352
xxiv.	7	318
xxxiv.	3	421
xxxv.	18	421
xlviii.	16	318

EXODUS.

i.	5	421
xx.	4-6	369
		232
	6	319
	19	454
xxxii.	4	391
	13	232
		319

LEVITICUS.

xviii.	5	114
xx.	6	421
xxvi.	6	435
	12	374

DEUTERONOMY.

xii.	8	262
xviii.	16	454
xxiv.	1-4	218
xxx.	19	157

1 SAMUEL.

xv.	22	261
xviii.	1	421

2 SAMUEL.

i.	9	421
xi.	11	420

1 KINGS.

viii.	46	130
xvii.	21	421
xix.	18	369
xxi.	29	142

2 KINGS.

v.	18	401
vi.	17	318

JOB.

iii.	11-19	487
iv.	19	425
v.	12	363
vii.	1	433
	7	488
	21	459
x.	9	454
	12	454
	20	486
xi.	18, 19	435
xiii.	14	420
xiii.	15	461
xiv.	1	476
	7-12	458
xvii.	1	488
xxi.	26	459
xxv.	4	194
xxxiv.	14	489

PSALMS.

ii.	8	205
iii.	6	458
iv.	7	147
	9	435
ix.	18	480
xiii.	4	458
xiv.	7	480
xvii.	13	149
	15	436
		468
xix.	12	213
xxviii.	1	480
xxx.	4	480
	6	483
	9	479
	12	486
xxxi.	6	428
xxxii.	1, 2	125
		152
	2	245
xxxiii.	10	476
	19	481
xxxiv.	1	486
xxxix.	11	478
	14	486
xli.	9	458
xlv.	13	442
xlix.	19	420
l.	13	223
li.	5	348
li.	10	196
	17	224
lii.	7	481
	9	486
liii.	15	480
lvi.	14	481
lxi.	8	486
lxviii.	20	449
lxxviii.	39	476
xcii.	13	449
cii.	24, 27, 28	489
ciii.	1	421
	5	449
	13	477
civ.	1	421
cxii.	6	479
	10	476
cxv.	17	479
cxvi.	10	310
cxviii.	17	485
cxix.	109	420
cxxi.	8	449
cxxx.	4	132
cxxxii.	1	319
	3	481
cxliii.	2	130
		147
		232
	3	480
cxlv.	1	486
cxlvi.	2	485
	4	475
cxlix.	5	435

PROVERBS.

iv.	18	444
xvi.	2	158
xix.	14	409

ECCLESIASTES.

Chap.	Ver.	Page
iii.	18-21	460
ix.	1	461
	3-5	461
xii.	7	430
		461

ISAIAH.

ii.	3	368
viii.	10	476
ix.	6	448
x.	5	149
xi.	2	286
xiv.	8	459
	18, 19	459
xxv.	8	455
xxvi.	9	422
	12	433
	18	422
	19	435
xxviii.	15	477
xxx.	1-3	363
	7	232
	15	435
xxxii.	18	432
xl.	6	477
xliii.	25	255
xlv.	23	369
	25	465
xlviii.	9	142
l.	12	261
lii.	11	370
		374
liii.	5	142
		222
	6	195
lv.	3	450
lvii.	1	433
	2	435
	21	458
lix.	2	198
lx.	19	449
lxiii.	3	222
lxvi.	24	195

JEREMIAH.

ii.	28	320
iii.	15	298
ix.	24	196
xi.	19	307
xxx.	33	448
xxxi.	15	487
	18	112
	31	224
xxxii.	39	111
xxxiii.	12	298

EZEKIEL.

i.	28	433
xvii.	20	149
xviii.	4	453
xx.	44	258
xxviii.	4	421
xxxii.	2	149
xxxiv.	2	298
xxxvi.	22	258
	27	111
xxxvii.	9	452

HOSEA.

ii.	18	435
xiii.	14	455
xiv.	2	306

JOEL.

ii.	23	449

JONAH.

iii.	4	447

MICAH.

iv.	2	368
vi.	8	362

HABAKKUK.

ii.	3	435
	4	122
		137

ZECHARIAH.

i.	12	231
v.	3	400
ix.	9	127

MALACHI.

i.	10	226
	11	226
		306

MATTHEW.

ii.	18	487
iii.	2	198
	11	110
v.	8, 9	435
	17	224
	19	399
	20	197
vi.	25	420
vii.	19	200
viii.	11	205
ix.	12	351
x.	28	427
xii.	23	480
xiii.	41	462
xv.	9	261
xvi.	17	253
xvii.	2	446
xviii.	17	203
xix.	5, 6	217
		220
	8, 9	218
	11	339
	13-15	212
	17	119
		157
		201
	21	262
xxi.	5	127
	25	275
	43	418
xxii.	32	347
		444
xxiv.	23	204
	31	462
xxv.	34	462
	41	448
xxvi.	26, 27	214
		225
	30	229
xxviii.	3	446
	19	209
		217

MARK.

i.	15	199
vi.	13	215
x.	5-9	218
xii.	27	444
xiv.	22	225
	26	229
xvi.	5	446
	15, 16	217

LUKE.

i.	46	421
	51	476
	77	139
		246
iii.	8	142
ix.	26	366
xi.	42	400
xii.	20	420
	32	127
xv.	22	446
xvi.	23	480
xvii.	10	232
	21	464
xxii.	19	225
	20	217
	42	446
xxiii.	46	428
xxiv.	49	211

JOHN.

i.	13	253
	29	222
ii.	19	428
iii.	3	110
	5	209
		353
	16	118
		195
		251
	27	253
iv.	53	408
v.	24	440
	26	436
vi.	37	156
	39	135
		155
	40	118
		440
	44	253
	45	113
		148
		254
	53	353
	54	440
	56	439
viii.	51	441
	56	434
x.	28	135
	34	475
xi.	11	457
	25, 26	440
	26	250
xii.	35	259
	42, 43	377
xiv.	19	439
	16	205
	17	126
	23	132
xv.	2	201
	6	200
xvi.	13	253
	26	211

Chap.	Ver.	Page
xvi.	33	119
xvii.	1	229
	24	449
xix.	30	428
xx.	21	212
		217
	22	138
		212
	23	212
		213
		217
	31	118

ACTS.

i.	8	205
	10	446
ii.	4, 23	149
	27	438
	39	127
iv.	12	123
	32	421
vii.	28	451
	59	428
	60	457
viii.	17	210
		286
ix.	17	184
		286
	40	474
x.	30	446
xiii.	38	115
	48	121
		155
xv.	9	118
		144
		150
	11	123
xvii.	11	417
xix.	6	286
xx.	10	421
	12	437
xxi.	26	404
xxiii.	8	426

ROMANS.

i.	5	251
		252
	16	122
	17	251
iii.	12	109
	22	127
		152
	24	153
	24, 25	195
		198
iii.	25	118
	27	122
iv.	2	122
	4	153
	6	248
		114
	11	181
	14	244
		115
		126
		146
		154
		156
		159
	16	123
		251
		252
	18	199
		466
v.	1	153
	2	122
		137
	5	253
	10	198
	11	252
		118
	12	194
		195
	14	118
	17	456
vi.	6	183
	9	457
	12	132
	19	117
vii.	23	132
	24	131
		440
viii.	7	194
	10	439
	15	126
		253
	16	426
		443
	17	133
		198
	18	232
	29	155
	37	125
x.	5	114
		156
	6	251
	10	252
		366
	14	316
xi.	16	348
	20	350
xii.	1	263
xiv.	8, 9	445
xiv.	17	329
	19	368
xv.	1, 2	405

1 CORINTHIANS.

i.	10	205
	30	246
	31	196
		198
ii.	2	252
	11	426
	12	126
		253
	14	194
		460
iii.	19	363
iv.	4	147
v.	10	374
vi.	11	196
		221
	15	372
vii.	2	219
	4	219
	9	339
	10, 11	218
	14	109
		347
	23	270
		328
	32	330
viii.	2, 3	375
	7-12	375
ix.	5	338
	20	405
x.	1	467
	3	173
		281
	4	281
	14-17	373
	17	214
	18-21	373
	22	374
xi.	23	309
	24	225
	28	323
	29, 30	214
	31	142
		259
xii.	11	146
	26	203
xiii.	13	200
xiv.	15, 26	237
	33	216
xv.	12	435
	19	411
		470
xv.	22	439
	24	464
	28	464
	42	450
	45	451
	54	457
	56	456
	58	200

2 CORINTHIANS.

i.	20	251
iii.	5	109
	18	252
iv.	6	251
	14	462
	16	442
v.	1	137
		444
	1-3	442
	6-8	442
	10	442
	19	114
		195
		222
		246
vi.	14	409
	14-16	374
	17	371
	18	374
vii.	1	425
	10	142
xiii.	5	127

GALATIANS.

ii.	20	119
		439
iii.	6	122
		251
	10	120
		129
		130
	22	251
	24	120
	27	209
v.	3	181
	6	119
		152
	16	210
	17	422

EPHESIANS.

i.	3	120
	4	155
		253

Chap.	Ver.	Page
i.	10	222
	17, 18	253
ii.	1	150
		455
	3	194
		195
	10	254
iii.	12	125
		252
	17	118
		144
	19	253
iv.	11	203
	13	252
		465
	15, 16	203
	24	424
v.	11	394
	14	455
	32	301
		172
	25-27	202
vi.	11	442
	16	144

PHILIPPIANS.

i.	6	444
	23	444
		474
	29	253
ii.	12	252
	13	148
	20	436
	27	474
iii.	8	252
	9	117
iv.	13	339

COLOSSIANS.

i.	15	447
	18	436
i.	19, 20	222
ii.	7	252
	13	455
	20	270
		329
iii.	3	439
	4	465
	10	424
	12	133

1 THESSALONIANS.

iv.	7	133
	13	323
		457
v.	13	435
	23	422

2 THESSALONIANS.

ii.	4	264
	8	464

1 TIMOTHY.

ii.	1, 2	229
	1	323
	5	220
iii.	2	338
iv.	1-3	378
	3	220
	2, 3	329
	1, 3	332
	8	137
	14	217
v.	6	455
	8	408

2 TIMOTHY.

ii.	12	410
iv.	7	317

TITUS.

ii.	11	133
iii.	5-7	197
	10	204

HEBREWS.

i.	14	318
iv.	12	422
v.	1	225
	4	312
vi.	10	200
viii.	10	111
ix.	12	221
x.	1	313
	12	223
	14	222
		223
	16	111
	27	466
xi.	6	150
	13	472
xii.	9	425
	23	425
xiii.	4	330
	8	447

JAMES.

i.	6	125
ii.	10	129
		146
	11	400
	17	199
	21	247
	24	130
		201
iv.	12	270
		329
v.	14	290
	16	231
		316
		323
vi.	14, 15	216

1 PETER.

i.	5	144
	9	425
	13	425
	22	425
ii.	24	195
iii.	15	368
	18	429
	21	182
iv.	6	429
v.	2	271
	9	144

2 PETER.

ii.	1	264
	25	425
iii.	8	447

1 JOHN.

i.	8	131
		197
ii.	1, 2	197
		222
iii.	2	137
		252
		465
	14	199
iv.	6	126
v.	3	131
	4	119
		114
		252

REVELATION.

vi.	10, 11	445
ix.	3-4	433
xiii.	8	222
		447
xiv.	13	433
xx.	6	446
xxii.	11	201

EDINBURGH : PRINTED BY T. CONSTABLE, PRINTER TO HER MAJESTY.



Date Due

FACULTY
FACULTY
JUN 15 1995
MAR 23 '65
For use in Library only
DEC 2005